arXiv:1603.05554v1 [math.AP] 17 Mar 2016

MULTIPLICITY RESULTS AND SIGN CHANGING SOLUTIONS OF NON-LOCAL EQUATIONS WITH CONCAVE-CONVEX NONLINEARITIES

MOUSOMI BHAKTA, DEBANGANA MUKHERJEE

Abstract. In this paper we prove the existence of infinitely many nontrivial solutions of the following equations driven by a nonlocal integro-differential operator L_K with concave-convex nonlinearities and homogeneous Dirichlet boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_K u + \mu|u|^{q-1}u + \lambda|u|^{p-1}u &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u &= 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{aligned}$$

where Ω is a smooth bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$, $N > 2s$, $s \in (0,1)$, $0 < q < 1 < p \le \frac{N+2s}{N-2s}$. Moreover, when L_K reduces to the fractional laplacian operator $-(-\Delta)^s$, $p = \frac{N+2s}{N-2s}$, $\frac{1}{2}(\frac{N+2s}{N-2s}) < q < 1$, $N > 6s$, $\lambda = 1$, we find $\mu^* > 0$ such that for any $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$, there exists at least one sign changing solution.

1. Introduction

In recent years, a great deal of attention has been devoted to fractional and non-local operators of elliptic type. One of the main reasons comes from the fact that this operator naturally arises in several physical phenomenon like flames propagation and chemical reaction of liquids, population dynamics, geophysical fluid dynamics, mathematical finance etc (see [4, 9, 15, 31, 32] and the references therein). In all these cases, the nonlocal effect was modeled by the singularity at infinity.

In this paper we mainly focus on the following problem with general integro-differential operator and concave-convex nonlinearities.

$$(\mathcal{P}_K) \begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_K u + \mu|u|^{q-1}u + \lambda|u|^{p-1}u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $s \in (0,1)$ is fixed, $N > 2s$, Ω is an open, bounded domain with smooth boundary, $0 < q < 1$, $1 < p \le 2^* - 1$ with $2^* = \frac{2N}{N-2s}$. Here $\mathcal{L}_K$ is the non-local operator defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_K u(x) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \left(u(x+y) + u(x-y) - 2u(x)\right) K(y)dy, \;\; x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{1.1}$$

Here $K : \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\} \to (0, +\infty)$ is a function defined such that

$$mK(x) \in L^1(\mathbb{R}^N) \quad \text{with} \quad m(x) = \min\{|x|^2, 1\}; \tag{1.2}$$

$$\text{there exists} \quad \theta > 0 \quad \text{such that} \quad K(x) \ge \theta|x|^{-(N+2s)} \quad \text{for any} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}; \tag{1.3}$$

$$\text{and} \quad K(x) = K(-x) \quad \text{for any} \quad x \in \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \{0\}. \tag{1.4}$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 35S15, 35J20, 49J35, secondary 47G20, 45G05.

Key words and phrases. concave-convex nonlinearity, sign changing solution, multiplicity, infinitely many solutions, fractional laplacian, nonlocal operator.

A model for K is given by $K(x) = |x|^{-(N+2s)}$. In this case L_K reduces to the fractional Laplace operator $-(-\Delta)^s$, defined below up to a normalization constant

$$-(-\Delta)^s u(x) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{u(x+y)+u(x-y)-2u(x)}{|y|^{N+2s}}dy, \;\; x \in \mathbb{R}^N. \tag{1.5}$$

By X we denote the linear space of Lebesgue measurable functions from $\mathbb{R}^N$ to $\mathbb{R}$ such that if $g \in X$ then $g|_\Omega \in L^2(\Omega)$ and

$$(g(x)-g(y))\sqrt{K(x-y)} \in L^2(Q, dxdy),$$

where $Q = \mathbb{R}^{2N} \setminus (C\Omega \times C\Omega)$ with $C\Omega = \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$. The space X is endowed with the norm defined:

$$\|u\|_X = \|u\|_{L^2(\Omega)} + \left(\int_Q |u(x)-u(y)|^2 K(x-y)dxdy\right)^{1/2}.$$

Then we define $X_0 := \Big\{u \in X : u = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\Big\}$ with the norm

$$\|u\|_{X_0} = \left(\int_Q |u(x)-u(y)|^2 K(x-y)dxdy\right)^{1/2}.$$

With this norm, X_0 is a Hilbert space with the scalar product

$$\langle u, v\rangle_{X_0} = \int_Q (u(x)-u(y))(v(x)-v(y))K(x-y)dxdy,$$

(see [26, lemma 7]). For further details on X and X_0 and for their properties, we refer to [18] and the references therein. Thanks to (1.2), it can be shown that $C_0^2(\Omega) \subseteq X_0$, see [27, Lemma 11] and so X and X_0 are non-empty .

Definition 1.1. *We say that $u \in X_0$ is a weak solution of $(\mathcal{P}_K)$ if*

$$\begin{aligned}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} (u(x)-u(y))(\phi(x)-\phi(y))K(x-y)dxdy &= \mu\int_\Omega |u(x)|^{q-1}u(x)\phi(x)dx \\ &+ \lambda\int_\Omega |u(x)|^{p-1}u(x)\phi(x)dx\end{aligned}$$

for all $\phi \in X_0$.

We denote by $H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$ the usual fractional Sobolev space endowed with the so-called Gagliardo norm

$$\|g\|_{H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)} = \|g\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)} + \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|g(x)-g(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}dxdy\right)^{1/2}.$$

When $K(x) = |x|^{-(N+2s)}$, X_0 reduces to $\Big\{u \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N) : u = 0 \quad \text{a.e. in} \quad \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega\Big\}$. When Ω is bounded, the norm in $X_0(\Omega)$ is equivalent to

$$\|u\|_{X_0(\Omega)} = \left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N\times\mathbb{R}^N} \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}dxdy\right)^{1/2},$$

(see [6]). By [18, Proposition 3.6] we have,

$$\|u\|_{X_0(\Omega)} = \left\|(-\Delta)^{s/2}u\right\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^N)}. \tag{1.6}$$

The Euler-Lagrange energy functional associated to $(\mathcal{P}_K)$ is

$$I_\mu^\lambda(u) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} |u(x)-u(y)|^2 K(x-y)dxdy - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx - \frac{\lambda}{p+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{p+1}dx. \tag{1.7}$$

Thanks to the Sobolev embedding $X_0 \hookrightarrow L^{2^*}(\mathbb{R}^N)$ (see [25, Lemma 9]), I_μ^λ is well defined C^1 functional on X_0. It is well known that there exists a one-to-one correspondence between the weak solutions of $(\mathcal{P}_K)$ and the critical point of I_μ^λ on X_0. We define the best fractional critical Sobolev constant S_k as

$$S_K := \inf_{v\in X_0\setminus\{0\}} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} |v(x)-v(y)|^2 K(x-y)dxdy}{\displaystyle\left(\int_\Omega |v(x)|^{2^*}\right)^{2/2^*}}. \tag{1.8}$$

A classical topic in nonlinear analysis is the study of existence and multiplicity of solutions for nonlinear equations. There are many results on the subject of concave-convex nonlinearity involving different local and nonlocal operators. Elliptic problems in bounded domains involving concave and convex terms have been studied extensively since Ambrosetti, Brezis and Cerami [2] considered the following equation:

$$(E_\mu)\begin{cases} -\Delta u = & \mu u^{q-1} + u^{p-1} \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u > & 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = & 0 \quad \text{on} \quad \partial\Omega, \end{cases}$$

where $1 < q < 2 < p \le \frac{2N}{N-2}$, $\mu > 0$ and Ω is a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$. They found that there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that (E_μ) admits at least two positive solutions for $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$, one positive solution for $\mu = \mu_0$ and no positive solution exists for $\mu > \mu_0$ (see also Ambrosetti, Azorero and Peral [3] for more references therein). Later on Adimurthi-Pacella-Yadava [1], Damascelli, Grossi and Pacella [17], Ouyang and Shi [22] and Tang [29] proved there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that for $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$, there are exactly two positive solutions of (E_μ) when Ω is the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$ and exactly one positive solution for $\mu = \mu_0$ and no positive solution exists for $\mu > \mu_0$. For the local operator we also quote [8, 12, 13, 20, 34] and the references therein. In past couple of years many of these results have been generalised to the case of nonlocal operators, we refer a few among them [5, 6, 10, 11, 19] and the references therein. As per our knowledge no result for sign changing solution involving non-local operator and concave-convex nonlinearity has been studied so far.

The main results of our paper are stated below. First we study the critical case $p = 2^* - 1, \lambda = 1$, that is,

$$(\mathcal{P}'_K)\begin{cases} \mathcal{L}_K u + \mu|u|^{q-1}u + |u|^{2^*-2}u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega. \end{cases}$$

Theorem 1.1. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with smooth boundary, $N > 2s$. Then there exists $\mu^* > 0$ such that for all $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$, problem $(\mathcal{P}'_K)$ has a sequence of non-trivial solutions $\{u_n\}_{n\ge1}$ such that $I(u_n) < 0$ and $I(u_n) \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$ where $I(.)$ is the corresponding energy functional associated with $(\mathcal{P}'_K)$.*

Remark 1.1. *Here we would like to mention that when $K(x) = |x|^{-(N+2s)}$, it has been proved in* [6] *(see also* [5]*) that there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that, $(\mathcal{P}'_K)$ has at least two positive solutions when $\mu \in (0, \Lambda)$, no positive solution when $\mu > \Lambda$ and at least one positive solution when $\mu = \Lambda$. Chen-Deng* [14] *have proved that $(\mathcal{P}'_K)$ has at least two positive solutions when $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$ for some $\mu_0 > 0$ under the assumption that*

$$\text{There exists } u_0 \in X_0 \text{ with } u_0 \ge 0 \text{ a.e. in } \Omega, \text{ such that } \sup_{t\ge0} I(tu_0) < \frac{s}{N} S_K^{\frac{N}{2s}}. \tag{1.9}$$

When $K(x) = |x|^{-(N+2s)}$, condition (1.9) *can be guaranteed by results of* [25].

The most important theorem in this paper is the following one, where we establish existence of at least one sign changing solution of $(\mathcal{P}'_K)$ when $K(x) = |x|^{-(N+2s)}$, i.e., $L_K = -(-\Delta)^s$, under suitable assumption on N and q.

Theorem 1.2. *Let Ω be a bounded domain with smooth boundary in $\mathbb{R}^N$. Assume $K(x) = |x|^{-(N+2s)}, s \in (0,1), N > 6s$, $\frac{1}{2}\big(\frac{N+2s}{N-2s}\big) < q < 1$. Then there exists $\mu^* > 0$ such that for all $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$ problem $(\mathcal{P}'_K)$ has at least one sign changing solution.*

In the succeeding theorem, we prove the existence of infinitely many nontrivial solutions in the subcritical case.

Theorem 1.3. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with smooth boundary, $N > 2s, s \in (0,1)$. Assume $1 < p < 2^* - 1$. Then*

(a) *For all $\lambda > 0,\ \mu \in \mathbb{R},\ (\mathcal{P}_K)$ has a sequence of nontrivial solutions $\{u_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ such that $I^\lambda_\mu(u_k) \to \infty$ as $k \longrightarrow \infty$. Furthermore, if $\lambda > 0,\ \mu \geq 0$, then $\|u_k\|_{X_0} \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$.*

(b) *For all $\mu > 0,\ \lambda \in \mathbb{R},\ (\mathcal{P}_K)$ has a sequence of nontrivial solutions $\{v_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ such that $I^\lambda_\mu(v_k) \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Furthermore, if $\mu > 0,\ \lambda \leq 0$, then $\|v_k\|_{X_0} \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$.*

Remark 1.2. *When $K(x) = |x|^{-(N+2s)}$, Brandle, et. al* [10] *have proved that there exists $\Lambda > 0$ such that, $(\mathcal{P}_K)$ has at least two positive solutions when $\mu \in (0, \Lambda)$, one positive solution when $\mu = \Lambda$ and no positive solution when $\mu > \Lambda$. For general K satisfying assumptions* (1.2)-(1.4)*, Chen-Deng* [14] *have proved that there exists at least two positive solutions of $(\mathcal{P}_K)$ when $\lambda = 1$ and $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$ for some $\mu_0 > 0$.*

To prove infinitely many nontrivial solutions of the above stated problems, we apply the Fountain Theorem and the Dual Fountain theorem which were proved by Bartsch [7] and Bartsch-Willem [8] respectively (also see [33]). As usual for critical point theorems, we need to study the compactness properties of the functional together with its geometric features. With respect to the compactness, we need to prove that the functional satisfies the classical Palais-Smale $(\mathrm{PS})_c$ assumption. But observe that $X_0 \hookrightarrow L^{2^*}(\Omega)$ is not compact (see [25, Lemma 9-b]). Hence the $(\mathrm{PS})_c$ condition does not hold globally for all c and we have to prove that the energy level of the corresponding energy functional lies below the threshold of application of the $(\mathrm{PS})_c$ condition. The proof of Theorem 1.2 is much delicate. There by using decomposition of Nehari manifold, we have estimated the energy and proved the existence of at least one sign changing solution. The proof is divided into several steps. The strategy to obtain a sign-changing solution follows from the ideas given in [13] (see also [30]) adapted to our nonlocal functional framework.

The paper is organised as follows. Section 2 is devoted to some notations and preliminaries about Fountain Theorem and Dual Fountain Theorem. In Section 3 we prove Theorem 1.1. In Section 4 we deal with sign changing solution, namely we study Theorem 1.2. In section 5 we study the subcritical problem, Theorem 1.3, Finally, in Section 6 we state results for a related problem that can be solved using our methods as in Theorem 1.1 and we also point out some related open questions in Section 8. Section 7 is appendix.

Notations: Throughout the paper C denotes a general positive constant which may vary from line to line.

2. **Preliminaries**

We start this section by recalling two abstract theorems namely the Fountain theorem and the Dual Fountain Theorem. For this, we need some definitions from [33].

Definition 2.1. *The action of a topological group G on a Banach space X is a continuous map*

$$G \times X \longrightarrow X : [g, u] \longrightarrow gu,$$

such that

$$1.u = u, \quad (gh)u = g(hu), \quad u \mapsto gu \quad \text{is linear.}$$

The action is isometric if $||gu|| = ||u||$. The space of invariant points is defined by

$$Fix\ (G) := \{u \in X : gu = u \quad \forall g \in G\}.$$

A set $A \subset X$ is called invariant if $gA = A$ for every $g \in G$. A functional $\varphi : X \longrightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called invariant if $\varphi \circ g = \varphi$ for every $g \in G$. A map $f : X \longrightarrow X$ is called equivariant if $g \circ f = f \circ g$ for every $g \in G$.

Definition 2.2. *Let G be a compact group on Banach space X_0. Assume that G acts diagonally on V^k*

$$g(v_1, \cdots, v_k) := (gv_1, \cdots, gv_k),$$

where V is a finite dimensional space. The action of G is admissible if every continuous equivariant map $\partial U \longrightarrow V^{k-1}$, where U is an open bounded invariant neighborhood of 0 in V^k, $k \geq 2$, has a zero.

By *Borsuk-Ulam Theorem, the antipodal action of $G := \mathbb{Z}/2$ on $V := \mathbb{R}$ is admissible (see* [33, Theorem D.17]*).*

We consider the following situation:

(A1) *The compact group G acts isometrically on the Banach space $X = \overline{\bigoplus_{j\in\mathbb{N}} X_j}$, the spaces X_j are invariant and there exists a finite dimensional space V such that, for every $j \in \mathbb{N}$, $X_j \simeq V$ and the action of G on V is admissible.*

Definition 2.3. *Let $\varphi \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$. We say that $\{u_n\}$ is a Palais-Smale sequence (in short, PS sequence) of φ at level c if $\varphi(u_n) \to c$ and $\varphi'(u_n) \to 0$ in $(X)'$, the dual space of X. Moreover, we say that φ satisfies $(PS)_c$ condition if $\{u_n\}$ is any (PS) sequence in X at level c implies $\{u_n\}$ has a convergent subsequence in X.*

Theorem 2.1. *[Fountain Theorem, Bartsch, 1993] Under the assumption (A1), let $\varphi \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ be an invariant functional. If, for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$, there exists $0 < r_k < \rho_k$ such that*

(A2) $a_k := \max_{u\in Y_k, ||u||=\rho_k} \varphi(u) \leq 0$,
(A3) $b_k := \inf_{u\in Z_k, ||u||=r_k} \varphi(u) \to \infty \quad as \quad k \to \infty$.
(A4) *φ satisfies $(PS)_c$ condition for every $c > 0$,*

then φ has an unbounded sequence of critical values.

Theorem 2.2. *[Dual Fountain Theorem, Bartsch-Willem, 1995] Under the assumption (A1), let $\varphi \in C^1(X, \mathbb{R})$ be an invariant functional. If, for every $k \geq k_0$, there exists $0 < r_k < \rho_k$ such that*

(D1) $a_k := \inf_{u\in Z_k, ||u||=\rho_k} \varphi(u) \geq 0$,
(D2) $b_k := \max_{u\in Y_k, ||u||=r_k} \varphi(u) < 0$,
(D3) $d_k := \inf_{u\in Z_k, ||u||\leq\rho_k} \varphi(u) \to 0 \quad as \quad k \to \infty$.
(D4) *For every sequence $u_{r_j} \in X$ and $c \in [d_k, 0)$ such that*

$$u_{r_j} \in Y_{r_j}, \quad \varphi(u_{r_j}) \to c \quad and \quad \varphi|'_{Y_{r_j}}(u_{r_j}) \to 0 \quad as \quad r_j \to \infty,$$

contains a subsequence converging to a critical point of φ,

then φ has a sequence of negative critical values converging to 0.

We choose an orthonormal basis $\{e_j\}_{j=1}^{\infty}$ *of* X_0 *(see* [24]*). Next, we consider the antipodal action of* $G := \mathbb{Z}/2$*. Define*

$$X_j = \mathbb{R}e_j, \quad Y_k := \bigoplus_{j=1}^{k} X_j, \quad Z_k := \overline{\bigoplus_{j=k}^{\infty} X_j}. \tag{2.1}$$

Lemma 2.1. *If* $1 \leq p+1 < 2^*$*, then we have that*

$$\beta_k := \sup_{u \in Z_k, \|u\|_{X_0}=1} |u|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)} \to 0 \quad as \quad k \to \infty.$$

Proof. Clearly, $0 < \beta_{k+1} \leq \beta_k$. Thus there exists $\beta \geq 0$, such that $\lim_{k\to\infty} \beta_k = \beta$. By the definition of β_k, for every $k \geq 1$, there exists $u_k \in Z_k$ such that $\|u_k\| = 1$ and $|u_k|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)} > \frac{\beta_k}{2}$. Using the definition of Z_k, it follows $u_k \rightharpoonup 0$ in X_0. Therefore Sobolev embedding implies $u_k \to 0$ in $L^{p+1}(\Omega)$ and this completes the proof. □

3. **Proof of Theorem 1.1**

Proof. The energy functional associated to $(\mathcal{P}'_K)$ is the following

$$\begin{aligned} I(u) &= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} |u(x)-u(y)|^2 K(x-y)dxdy - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |u|^{2^*}dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2}||u||^2_{X_0} - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |u|^{2^*}dx, \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

where $\mu > 0$. We will show that I satisfies all the assumptions of Theorem 2.2. X_j, Y_j, Z_j are chosen as in (2.1) and $G := \mathbb{Z}/2$. Therefore (A1) is satisfied.

Next to check (D1) holds, we define

$$\beta_k := \sup_{u \in Z_k, \|u\|_{X_0}=1} |u|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}, \quad c := \sup_{u \in X_0, \|u\|_{X_0}=1} |u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \quad \text{and} \quad R := \left(\frac{2^*}{4c}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}}.$$

It is easy to see, $||u||_{X_0} \leq R$ implies $\frac{c}{2^*}||u||^{2^*}_{X_0} \leq \frac{1}{4}||u||^2_{X_0}$. Therefore for $u \in Z_k$, $\|u\|_{X_0} \leq R$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} I(u) &\geq \frac{\|u\|^2_{X_0}}{2} - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\beta_k^{q+1}\|u\|^{q+1}_{X_0} - \frac{c}{2^*}\|u\|^{2^*}_{X_0} \\ &\geq \frac{\|u\|^2_{X_0}}{4} - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\beta_k^{q+1}\|u\|^{q+1}_{X_0} \end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Choose $\rho_k := (\frac{4\mu\beta_k^{q+1}}{q+1})^{\frac{1}{1-q}}$. Using Lemma 2.1, we see that $\beta_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. As a consequence $\rho_k \to 0$. Thus for k large, $u \in Z_k$ and $\|u\|_{X_0} = \rho_k$ we have $I(u) \geq 0$ and (D1) holds true.

To see (D2) holds we note that Y_k is finite dimensional and in finite dimensional space all the norms are equivalent. Therefore (D2) is satisfied if we choose $r_k > 0$ small enough (since $\mu > 0$) and therefore we can choose $r_k = \frac{\rho_k}{2}$.

For k large, $u \in Z_k, \|u\|_{X_0} \leq \rho_k$, we have from (3.2) that $d_k \geq \frac{-\mu}{q+1}\beta_k^{q+1}\rho_k^{q+1}$. On the other hand as $\mu > 0$ from the definition of $I(u)$ it follows $I(u) \leq \frac{\rho_k^2}{2}$. Thu $d_k \leq \frac{1}{2}\rho_k^2$ Using both upper and lower bounds of d_k and Lemma 2.1, we see that (D3) is also satisfied.

To check the assertion (D4), we consider a sequence $\{u_{r_j}\} \subset X_0$ such that as

$$\{u_{r_j}\} \in Y_{r_j}, \quad I(u_{r_j}) \to c, \quad I'|_{Y_{r_j}}(u_{r_j}) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad r_j \to \infty. \tag{3.3}$$

Claim: There exists $k > 0$ such that if $\mu > 0$ is arbitrarily chosen and

$$c < \frac{s}{N} S_K^{\frac{N}{2s}} - k\mu^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-q-1}}, \tag{3.4}$$

then $\{u_{r_j}\}$ contains a subsequence converging to a critical point of I, where $\{u_{r_j}\}$ is as in (3.3).

Assuming the claim, first let us complete the proof. Towards this, we choose $\mu^* = \left(\frac{sS_K^{\frac{N}{2s}}}{Nk}\right)^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}}$. Then $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$ implies $\frac{s}{N} S_K^{\frac{N}{2s}} > k\mu^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-q-1}}$. Thus, if $c \in [d_k, 0)$ then we have

$$c < 0 < \frac{s}{N} S_K^{\frac{N}{2s}} - k\mu^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-q-1}}.$$

Hence applying the above claim, we see that (D4) holds true. Therefore the result follows by Theorem 2.2.

Here we prove the claim dividing into four steps.

Step 1: $\{u_{r_j}\}$ is bounded in X_0.
This follows by standard arguments. More precisely, since $I(u_{r_j}) = c+o(1)$ and $\langle I'(u_{r_j}), u_{r_j}\rangle = o(1)||u_{r_j}||_{X_0}$, computing $I(u_{r_j}) - \frac{1}{2}\langle I'(u_{r_j}), u_{r_j}\rangle$, we get $|u_{r_j}|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \le C_1 + \|u_{r_j}\|_{X_0} o(1) + C_2|u_{r_j}|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}$. Therefore using the definition of I along with Sobolev inequality yields

$$\|u_{r_j}\|^2_{X_0} \le C\left[1 + ||u_{r_j}||_{X_0} o(1) + ||u_{r_j}||^{q+1}_{X_0}\right]$$

and hence the boundedness follows. Therefore passing to a subsequence if necessary we may assume $u_{r_j} \rightharpoonup u$ in X_0, $u_{r_j} \to u$ in $L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $1 \le \gamma < 2^*$ and point-wise.

Step 2: $\{u_{r_j}\}$ is a PS sequence in X_0 at level c, where c is as in (3.4).
To see this, let $v \in X_0$ be arbitrarily chosen. Then

$$\langle I'(u_{r_j}), v\rangle = \langle u_{r_j}, v\rangle - \int_\Omega |u_{r_j}|^{2^*-2} u_{r_j} v dx - \mu \int_\Omega |u_{r_j}|^{q-1} u_{r_j} v dx. \tag{3.5}$$

Therefore, using Sobolev inequality and Step 1 we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle I'(u_{r_j}), v\rangle| &\le \|u_{r_j}\|_{X_0} \|v\|_{X_0} + \int_\Omega |u_{r_j}|^{2^*-1}|v|dx + \mu \int_\Omega |u_{r_j}|^q |v| dx \\
&\le \|u_{r_j}\|_{X_0} \|v\|_{X_0} + c_1 \|u_{r_j}\|^{2^*-1}_{X_0} \|v\|_{X_0} + c_2\mu \|u_{r_j}\|^q_{X_0} \|v\|_{X_0} \\
&\le (\|u_{r_j}\|_{X_0} + c_1 \|u_{r_j}\|^{2^*-1}_{X_0} + c_2\mu \|u_{r_j}\|^q_{X_0}) \|v\|_{X_0} \\
&\le C \|v\|_{X_0},
\end{aligned}$$

which in turn implies $\|I'(u_{r_j})\|_{(X_0)'} \le M$ for all $j \ge 1$.

By the definition of Y_{r_j}, there exists a sequence $(v_{r_j}) \in Y_{r_j}$ such that $v_{r_j} \to v$ in X_0 as $r_j \to \infty$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle I'(u_{r_j}), v\rangle| &\le |\langle I'(u_{r_j}), v_{r_j}\rangle| + |\langle I'(u_{r_j}), v - v_{r_j}\rangle| \\
&\le \left\|I'|_{Y_{r_j}}(u_{r_j})\right\|_{(X_0)'} \|v_{r_j}\|_{X_0} + \|I'(u_{r_j})\|_{(X_0)'} \|v - v_{r_j}\|_{X_0}.
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the hypothesis $I'|_{Y_{r_j}}(u_{r_j}) \to 0$ as $r_j \to \infty$ (see (3.3)), Step 1 and the fact that $\{I'(u_{r_j})\}$ is uniformly bounded, we have $|\left\langle I'(u_{r_j}), v\right\rangle| \to 0$ as $r_j \to \infty$. This in turn implies that $\{u_{r_j}\}$ is a PS sequence in X_0 at level c, where c is as in (3.4).

Step 3: u satisfies $(\mathcal{P}'_K)$.
Using Vitali's convergence theorem via Hölder inequality and Sobolev inequality, it is not difficult to check that we can pass the limit $r_j \to \infty$ in (3.5), Thus we obtain $\langle I'(u), v\rangle = 0$ for every v in X_0. Hence, $\mathcal{L}_K u + \mu|u|^{q-1}u + |u|^{2^*-2}u = 0 \quad \text{in} \quad \Omega.$

Step 4: Define $v_{r_j} := u_{r_j} - u$. Then it is not difficult to see that,

$$\left\|v_{r_j}\right\|^2_{X_0} = \left\|u_{r_j}\right\|^2_{X_0} - \|u\|^2_{X_0} + o(1). \tag{3.6}$$

On the other hand, by Brezis-Lieb lemma, we have

$$|u_{r_j}|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} = |v_{r_j}|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} + |u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} + o(1). \tag{3.7}$$

Therefore by doing a straight forward computation and using $I(u_{r_j}) \to c$, we get

$$I(u) + \frac{1}{2}\left\|v_{r_j}\right\|^2_{X_0} - \frac{1}{2^*}|v_{r_j}|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \to c. \tag{3.8}$$

Since $\left\langle I'(u_{r_j}), u_{r_j}\right\rangle \to 0$ and $\langle I'(u), u\rangle = 0$, from (3.6) and (3.7), we also have

$$\left\|v_{r_j}\right\|^2_{X_0} - |v_{r_j}|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \to 0.$$

Therefore, we may assume that

$$\left\|v_{r_j}\right\|^2 \to b, \;\; |v_{r_j}|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \to b.$$

By Sobolev inequality, $\left\|v_{r_j}\right\|^2_{X_0} \geq (|v_{r_j}|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)})^{2/2^*}$. As a result, we get $b \geq S_K b^{2/2^*}$. We note that if $b = 0$, then we are done since that implies $u_{r_j} \to u$ in X_0. Assume $b \neq 0$. This in turn implies $b \geq S_K^{\frac{N}{2s}}$ Then by (3.8), we have

$$I(u) = c - \frac{b}{2} + \frac{b}{2^*}. \tag{3.9}$$

It is easy to see that $\langle I'(u), u\rangle = 0$ implies

$$I(u) = \frac{s}{N}|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)\mu|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \tag{3.10}$$

Combining (3.9) and (3.10) and using $q \in (0,1)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} c &= \frac{s}{N}(b + |u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}) + \mu\left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{q+1}\right)|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \\ &\geq \frac{s}{N}(S_K^{\frac{2s}{N}} + |u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}) - \frac{1-q}{2(1+q)}\mu|\Omega|^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}}|u|^{q+1}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \\ &= \frac{s}{N}S_K^{\frac{N}{2s}} + \frac{s}{N}|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} - a\mu|u|^{q+1}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

where $a := \frac{1-q}{2(1+q)}|\Omega|^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}} > 0$. We define

$$g(t) = \frac{s}{N}t^{2^*} - a\mu t^{q+1}, \quad t \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad k := -\frac{1}{\mu^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-q-1}}}\min_{t\geq 0} g(t). \tag{3.12}$$

By elementary analysis it is easy to check that if $t_0 = (\frac{a\mu N}{s})^{\frac{1}{2^*-q-1}}$, then $g(t) < 0$ for $t \in (0, t_0)$, $g(t) \geq 0$ for $t \geq t_0$ and $g(0) = 0$. Hence, there exists $t' \in (0, t_0)$ for which g attains minimum and $\min_{t>0} g(t) < 0$. Thus $k > 0$. Hence from (3.11) we have $c \geq$

$\frac{s}{N}S_K^{\frac{N}{2s}} - k\mu^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-q-1}}$, which is a contradiction to (3.4). Therefore, $b = 0$ and the claim follows. □

4. **Critical-concave fractional Laplace equation and sign changing solution**

In this section we consider the problem $(\mathcal{P}'_K)$ when $K(x) = |x|^{-(N+2s)}$. More precisely we study,

$$(P)\begin{cases}(-\Delta)^s u = \mu|u|^{q-1}u + |u|^{2^*-2}u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \Omega,\\ u = 0 & \text{in} \quad \mathbb{R}^n \setminus \Omega.\end{cases}$$

Corresponding to (P), define the energy functional I_μ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} I_\mu(u) &:= \frac{1}{2}\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}dxdy - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |u|^{2^*}dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2}||u||^2 - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |u|^{2^*}dx, \end{aligned} \tag{4.1}$$

where $||u|| := ||u||_{X_0}$. From [25, Lemma 9], we know

$$S_s\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|v(x)|^{2^*}\right)^{2/2^*} \le ||v||^2 \quad \forall \quad v \in X_0, \tag{4.2}$$

where

$$S_s = \inf_{v\in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N), v\neq 0} \frac{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{|v(x)-v(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}dxdy}{\left(\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|v(x)|^{2^*}\right)^{2/2^*}}. \tag{4.3}$$

It is known that (see [16]), S_s is attained by $v_\varepsilon \in H^s(\mathbb{R}^N)$, where

$$v_\varepsilon(x) := \frac{k\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{4}}}{(\varepsilon+|x|^2)^{\frac{N-2s}{2}}}, \quad \text{with} \quad \varepsilon > 0, k \in \mathbb{R}\setminus\{0\}. \tag{4.4}$$

We note that $v_\varepsilon \notin X_0$. Therefore we multiply v_ε by a suitable cut-off function ψ in order to put v_ε to 0 outside Ω. For this, fix $\delta > 0$. Define $\Omega_1 = \{x \in \Omega : \text{dist}(x, \partial\Omega) > \delta\}$. We choose $\psi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^N)$ such that $0 \le \psi \le 1$, $\psi = 1$ in Ω_1, $\psi = 0$ in $\mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega$ and $\psi > 0$ in Ω. We define

$$u_\varepsilon(x) := \psi(x)v_\varepsilon(x). \tag{4.5}$$

To obtain sign changing solution of (P), we need to study minimization problems of I_μ over suitable Nehari-type sets. We define the following sets in the spirit of [30] (also see [13])

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N} &:= \{u \in X_0 \setminus \{0\} : \langle I'_\mu(u), u\rangle = 0\};\\ \mathcal{N}_0 &:= \left\{u \in \mathcal{N} : (1-q)\|u\|^2 - (2^*-q-1)|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} = 0\right\};\\ \mathcal{N}^+ &:= \left\{u \in \mathcal{N} : (1-q)\|u\|^2 - (2^*-q-1)|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} > 0\right\};\\ \mathcal{N}^- &:= \left\{u \in \mathcal{N} : (1-q)\|u\|^2 - (2^*-q-1)|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} < 0\right\}. \end{aligned}$$

From [14], it is known that there exists $\mu_* > 0$ such that, if $\mu \in (0, \mu_*)$, then the following minimization problem:

$$\tilde{\alpha}^+_\mu := \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}^+} J_\mu(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu := \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}^-} J_\mu(u) \tag{4.6}$$

achieve their minimum at w_0 and w_1 respectively, where

$$J_\mu(u) := \frac{1}{2}||u||^2 - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega (u^+)^{q+1}dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega (u^+)^{2^*}dx. \tag{4.7}$$

Moreover w_0 and w_1 are critical points of J_μ. Using maximum principle [28, Proposition 2.2.8] and followed by a simple calculation , it can be checked that, if u is a critical point of J_μ, then u is strictly positive in Ω (see [6]). Thus w_0 and w_1 are positive solution of $(\mathcal{P})$. Applying the Moser iteration technique it follows that any positive solution of (P) is in $L^\infty(\Omega)$ (see [6, Proposition 2.2]).

We need the following lemmas in order to prove Theorem 1.2.

Lemma 4.1. *Suppose w_1 is a positive solution of (P) and u_ε is as defined in (4.5). Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, small enough*

(i) $A_1 := \displaystyle\int_\Omega w_1^{2^*-1}u_\varepsilon dx \le k_1\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{4}}$;

(ii) $A_2 := \displaystyle\int_\Omega w_1^{q}u_\varepsilon dx \le k_2\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{4}}$;

(iii) $A_3 := \displaystyle\int_\Omega w_1 u_\varepsilon^{q} dx \le k_3\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{4}q}$;

(iv) $A_4 := \displaystyle\int_\Omega w_1 u_\varepsilon^{2^*-1} dx \le k_4\varepsilon^{\frac{N+2s}{4}}$.

Proof. Let $R,\ M > 0$ be such that $\Omega \subset B(0,R)$ and $|w_1|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} < M$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
(i)\quad A_1 = \int_\Omega w_1^{2^*-1}u_\varepsilon dx &\le M^{2^*-1}|\psi|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}k\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{4}}\int_{B(0,R)}\frac{dx}{(\varepsilon+|x|^2)^{\frac{N-2s}{2}}}\\
&\le C\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-\frac{N-2s}{4}}\int_{B(0,\frac{R}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}})}\frac{dx}{(1+|x|^2)^{\frac{N-2s}{2}}}\\
&\le k_1\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{4}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof of (ii) similar to (i).

$$\begin{aligned}
(iii)\quad A_3 = \int_\Omega w_1 u_\varepsilon^{q} dx &\le M|\psi|^q_{L^\infty(\Omega)}k^q\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{4}q}\int_{B(0,R)}\frac{dx}{(\varepsilon+|x|^2)^{\frac{N-2s}{2}q}}\\
&\le C\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-\frac{(N-2s)q}{4}}\int_0^{\frac{R}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}}\frac{r^{N-1}dr}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{(N-2s)q}{2}}}\\
&\le C\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-\frac{(N-2s)q}{4}}\left(\frac{R}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right)^{N-(N-2s)q}\\
&\le k_3\varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{4}q}.
\end{aligned}$$

(iv) can be proved as in (iii). □

Lemma 4.2. *Let u_ε be as defined in (4.5) and $0 < q < 1$. Then for every $\varepsilon > 0$, small*

$$\int_\Omega |u_\epsilon|^{q+1}dx = \begin{cases} k_5\varepsilon^{(\frac{N-2s}{4})(q+1)} & \text{if}\quad 0 < q < \frac{2s}{N-2s},\\ k_6\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{4}}|ln\ \varepsilon|, & \text{if}\quad q = \frac{2s}{N-2s},\\ k_7\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-(\frac{N-2s}{4})(q+1)} & \text{if}\quad \frac{2s}{N-2s} < q < 1. \end{cases}$$

Proof. Choose $0 < R' < R$ be such that $B(0,R') \subset \Omega_1 \subset \Omega$. Then $u_\varepsilon = v_\varepsilon$ in $B(0,R')$. Then

$$\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}dx \geqslant \int_{B(0,R')} |u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}dx = k^{q+1}\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{4}} \int_{B(0,R')} \frac{dx}{(\varepsilon+|x|^2)^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}}.$$

Proceeding as in the proof of Lemma 4.1 (iii), we have

$$\begin{aligned} C\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{4}} \int_0^{\frac{R'}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} \frac{r^{N-1}dr}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}} &\leq \int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}dx \\ &\leq C\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{4}} \int_0^{\frac{R}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} \frac{r^{N-1}dr}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}}. \end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Case 1 : $0 < q < \frac{2s}{N-2s}$.
We note that

$$\int_0^{\frac{R'}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} \frac{r^{N-1}dr}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}} \geq C\int_{\frac{R'}{2\sqrt{\varepsilon}}}^{\frac{R'}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} r^{N-1-(N-2s)(q+1)}dr \geq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}} \tag{4.9}$$

and

$$\int_0^{\frac{R}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} \frac{r^{N-1}dr}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}} \leq \int_0^{\frac{R}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} r^{N-1-(N-2s)(q+1)}dr \leq \frac{C}{\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}}. \tag{4.10}$$

Substituting back (4.9) and (4.10) into (4.8), we obtain $\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}dx = k_5\varepsilon^{(\frac{N-2s}{4})(q+1)}$.

Case 2 : $q = \frac{2s}{N-2s}$.
Then

$$\int_0^{\frac{R'}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} \frac{r^{N-1}dr}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}} \geq C\int_1^{\frac{R'}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} r^{N-1-(N-2s)(q+1)}dr \geq C'|\ln\,\varepsilon|.$$

$$\int_0^{\frac{R}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} \frac{r^{N-1}dr}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}} \leq \int_0^1 r^{N-1}dr + \int_1^{\frac{R}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} r^{N-1-(N-2s)(q+1)}dr \leq C(1+|\ln\,\varepsilon|) \leq 2C|\ln\,\varepsilon|.$$

Substituting back the above two expressions in (4.8), we have
$\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}dx = k_6\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{4}}|ln\ \varepsilon|$.
Case 3 : $\frac{2s}{N-2s} < q < 1$.
Therefore $(N-2s)(q+1) > N$ and consequently

$$\int_0^{\frac{R'}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} \frac{r^{N-1}dr}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}} \geq C\int_0^1 r^{N-1}dr = C,$$

$$\int_0^{\frac{R}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}} \frac{r^{N-1}dr}{(1+r^2)^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{2}}} \leq \int_0^1 r^{N-1}dr + \int_1^\infty r^{N-1-(N-2s)(q+1)} \leq C,$$

Hence $\int_\Omega |u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}dx = k_7\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{4}}$. □

Set

$$\tilde{\mu} = \left(\frac{1-q}{2^*-q-1}\right)^{\frac{1-q}{2^*-2}} \frac{2^*-2}{2^*-q-1}|\Omega|^{\frac{q+1-2^*}{2^*}} S_s^{\frac{N(1-q)}{4s}+\frac{q+1}{2}}. \tag{4.11}$$

We prove the next three lemmas in the spirit of [30].

Lemma 4.3. *Let $\mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu})$. For every $u \in X_0,\ u \neq 0$, there exists unique*

$$0 < t^-(u) < t_0(u) = \left(\frac{(1-q)\|u\|^2}{(2^*-1-q)|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}} \right)^{\frac{N-2s}{4s}} < t^+(u),$$

such that

$$t^-(u)u \in \mathcal{N}^+ \quad \text{and} \quad I_\mu(t^-u) = \min_{t\in[0,t_0]} I_\mu(tu),$$
$$t^+(u)u \in \mathcal{N}^- \quad \text{and} \quad I_\mu(t^+u) = \max_{t\geq t_0} I_\mu(tu).$$

Proof. From (4.1), for $t \geq 0$,

$$I_\mu(tu) = \frac{t^2}{2}\|u\|^2 - \frac{\mu t^{q+1}}{q+1}|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} - \frac{t^{2^*}}{2^*}|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}.$$

Therefore

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} I_\mu(tu) = t^q \left(t^{1-q}\|u\|^2 - t^{2^*-q-1}|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} - \mu|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \right).$$

Define

$$\phi(t) = t^{1-q}\|u\|^2 - t^{2^*-q-1}|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}. \tag{4.12}$$

By a straight forward computation, it follows that ϕ attains maximum at the point

$$t_0 = t_0(u) = \left(\frac{(1-q)\|u\|^2}{(2^*-1-q)|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}}. \tag{4.13}$$

Thus

$$\phi'(t_0) = 0, \quad \phi'(t) > 0 \quad \text{if} \quad t < t_0, \quad \phi'(t) < 0 \quad \text{if} \quad t > t_0. \tag{4.14}$$

Moreover, $\phi(t_0) = \left(\frac{1-q}{2^*-1-q}\right)^{\frac{1-q}{2^*-2}} \left(\frac{2^*-2}{2^*-1-q}\right) \left(\frac{\|u\|^{2(2^*-q-1)}}{|u|^{2^*(1-q)}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}} \right)^{\frac{N-2s}{4s}}$. Therefore using (4.2), we have

$$\phi(t_0) \geq \left(\frac{1-q}{2^*-1-q} \right)^{\frac{(1-q)(N-2s)}{4s}} \frac{2^*-2}{2^*-1-q} S_s^{\frac{N(1-q)}{4s}} \|u\|^{q+1}. \tag{4.15}$$

Using Hölder inequality followed by Sobolev inequality (4.2), and the fact that $\mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu})$, we obtain

$$\mu \int_\Omega |u|^{q+1} dx \leq \mu \|u\|^{q+1} S^{-(q+1)/2} |\Omega|^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}} \leq \tilde{\mu}\|u\|^{q+1} S_s^{-(q+1)/2} |\Omega|^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}} \leq \phi(t_0),$$

where in the last inequality we have used expression of $\tilde{\mu}$ (see (4.11)) and (4.15). Hence, there exists $t^+(u) > t_0 > t^-(u)$ such that

$$\phi(t^+) = \mu \int_\Omega |u|^{q+1} = \phi(t^-) \quad \text{and} \quad \phi'(t^+) < 0 < \phi'(t^-). \tag{4.16}$$



This in turn, implies $t^+u \in \mathcal{N}^-$ and $t^-u \in \mathcal{N}^+$. Moreover, using (4.14) and (4.16) in the expression of $\frac{\partial}{\partial t}I_\mu(tu)$, we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}I_\mu(tu) > 0 \quad \text{when} \quad t \in (t^-, t^+) \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial t}I_\mu(tu) < 0 \quad \text{when} \quad t \in [0, t^-) \cup (t^+, \infty),$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}I_\mu(tu) = 0 \quad \text{when} \quad t = t^\pm.$$

We note that $I_\mu(tu) = 0$ at $t = 0$ and strictly negative when $t > 0$ is small enough. Therefore it is easy to conclude that

$$\max_{t \geq t_0} I_\mu(tu) = I_\mu(t^+u) \quad \text{and} \quad \min_{t \in [0,t_0]} I_\mu(tu) = I_\mu(t^-u).$$

□

Lemma 4.4. *Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be defined as in* (4.11)*. Then $\mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu})$, implies $\mathcal{N}_0 = \emptyset$.*

Proof. Suppose not. Then there exists $w \in \mathcal{N}_0$ such that $w \neq 0$ and

$$(1-q)\|w\|^2 - (2^* - q - 1)|w|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} = 0. \tag{4.17}$$

The above expression combined with Sobolev inequality (4.2) yields

$$\|w\| \geq S_s^{N/4s} \left(\frac{1-q}{2^* - 1 - q}\right)^{\frac{N-2s}{4s}}. \tag{4.18}$$

As $w \in \mathcal{N}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{N}$, using (4.17) and Hölder inequality followed by Sobolev inequality, we get

$$\begin{aligned} 0 &= \|w\|^2 - |w|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} - \mu|w|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \\ &\geq \|w\|^2 - \left(\frac{1-q}{2^* - q - 1}\right)||w||^2 - \mu|\Omega|^{1-\frac{q+1}{2^*}} S_s^{-(q+1)/2}||w||^{q+1}. \end{aligned}$$

Combining the above inequality with (4.18) and using $\mu < \tilde{\mu}$, we have

$$0 \geq \|w\|^{q+1}\left[\left(\frac{2^*-2}{2^*-q-1}\right)\left(\frac{1-q}{2^*-q-1}\right)^{\frac{(N-2s)(1-q)}{4s}} S_s^{\frac{N(1-q)}{4s}} - \mu|\Omega|^{1-\frac{q+1}{2^*}} S_s^{-(q+1)/2}\right] > 0,$$

which is a contradiction. This completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\tilde{\mu}$ be defined as in (4.11) and $\mu \in (0, \tilde{\mu})$. Given $u \in \mathcal{N}$, there exists $\rho_u > 0$ and a differential function $g_{\rho_u} : B_{\rho_u}(0) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ satisfying the following:*

$$g_{\rho_u}(0) = 1,$$
$$\big(g_{\rho_u}(w)\big)(u+w) \in \mathcal{N} \quad \forall \quad w \in B_{\rho_u}(0),$$
$$\big\langle g'_{\rho_u}(0), \phi \big\rangle = \frac{2\langle u, \phi\rangle - 2^* \int_\Omega |u|^{2^*-2} u\phi - (q+1)\mu \int_\Omega |u|^{q-1}u\phi}{(1-q)\|u\|^2 - (2^*-q-1)|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}.$$

Proof. Define $F : \mathbb{R}^+ \times X_0 \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$F(t,w) = t^{1-q}\|u+w\|^2 - t^{2^*-q-1}|u+w|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} - \mu|u+w|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}.$$

We note that $u \in \mathcal{N}$ implies

$$F(1,0) = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(1,0) = (1-q)\|u\|^2 - (2^*-q-1)|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \neq 0.$$

Therefore, by Implicit function theorem, there exists neighbourhood $B_{\rho_u}(0)$ for some $\rho_u > 0$ and a C^1 function $g_{\rho_u} : B_{\rho_u}(0) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

$$(i)\ g_{\rho_u}(0) = 1, \quad (ii)\ F(g_{\rho_u}(w), w) = 0,\ \forall\ w \in B_{\rho_u}(0),$$
$$(iii) F_t(g_{\rho_u}(w), w) \neq 0,\ \forall\ w \in B_{\rho_u}(0), \quad (iv)\ \big\langle g'_{\rho_u}(0), \phi\big\rangle = -\frac{\big\langle \frac{\partial F}{\partial w}(1,0), \phi\big\rangle}{\frac{\partial F}{\partial t}(1,0)}.$$

Multiplying (ii) by $(g_{\rho_u}(w))^{q+1}$, it follows that $(g_{\rho_u}(w))(u+w) \in \mathcal{N}$. In fact, simplifying (iii), we obtain

$$(1-q)(g_{\rho_u}(w))^2||u+w||^2 - (2^*-q-1)(g_{\rho_u}(w))^{2^*}|u+w|^{2^*}_{2^*} \neq 0 \quad \forall\ w \in B_{\rho_u}(0).$$

Thus $\big(g_{\rho_u}(w)\big)(u+w) \in \mathcal{N}^- \cup \mathcal{N}^+$ for every $w \in B_{\rho_u}(0)$. The last assertion of the lemma follows from (iv). □

4.1. **Sign changing critical points of I_μ.** Define

$$\mathcal{N}_1^- := \{u \in \mathcal{N} : u^+ \in \mathcal{N}^-\},$$
$$\mathcal{N}_2^- := \{u \in \mathcal{N} : -u^- \in \mathcal{N}^-\},$$

We set

$$\beta_1 = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{N}_1^-} I_\mu(u) \quad \text{and} \quad \beta_2 = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{N}_2^-} I_\mu(u). \tag{4.19}$$

Theorem 4.1. *Assume $0 < \mu < min\{\tilde{\mu}, \mu_*, \mu_1\}$, where μ_1 is as in Lemma 7.1, $\tilde{\mu}$ is as in (4.11) and μ_* is chosen such that $\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$ is achieved in $(0, \mu_*)$. Let β_1, β_2, $\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$ be defined as in (4.19) and (4.6) respectively.*

(i) *Let $\beta_1 < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$. Then there exists a sign changing critical point $\tilde{w}_1$ of I_μ such that $\tilde{w}_1 \in \mathcal{N}_1^-$ and $I_\mu(\tilde{w}_1) = \beta_1$.*

(ii) *If $\beta_2 < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$, then there exists a sign changing critical point $\tilde{w}_2$ of I_μ such that in $\tilde{w}_2 \in \mathcal{N}_1^-$ and $I_\mu(\tilde{w}_2) = \beta_2$.*

Proof. (i) Let $\beta_1 < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$.

Claim 1: $\mathcal{N}_1^-$ and $\mathcal{N}_2^-$ are closed sets.
To see this, let $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{N}_1^-$ such that $u_n \to u$ in X_0. It is easy to note that $|u_n|, |u| \in X_0$ and $|u_n| \to |u|$ in X_0. This in turn implies $u_n^+ \to u^+$ in X_0 and $L^\gamma(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for $\gamma \in [1, 2^*]$ (by (4.2)). Since, $u_n \in \mathcal{N}_1^-$, we have $u_n^+ \in \mathcal{N}^-$. Therefore

$$\big\|u_n^+\big\|^2 - |u_n^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} - \mu|u_n^+|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} = 0 \tag{4.20}$$

and

$$(1-q)\left\|u_n^+\right\|^2-(2^*-q-1)|u_n^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}<0\ \forall\ n\geq 1. \tag{4.21}$$

Passing to the limit as $n\to\infty$, we obtain $u^+\in\mathcal{N}$ and $(1-q)\left\|u^+\right\|^2-(2^*-q-1)|u^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}\leq 0$. But, from Lemma 4.4, we know $\mathcal{N}_0=\emptyset$. Therefore $u^+\in\mathcal{N}^-$ and hence $\mathcal{N}_1^-$ is closed. Similarly it can be shown that $\mathcal{N}_2^-$ is also closed. Hence claim 1 follows.

By Ekeland Variational Principle there exists sequence $\{u_n\}\subset\mathcal{N}_1^-$ such that

$$I_\mu(u_n)\to\beta_1\quad\text{and}\quad I_\mu(z)\geq I_\mu(u_n)-\frac{1}{n}\left\|u_n-z\right\|\quad\forall\quad z\in\mathcal{N}_1^-. \tag{4.22}$$

Claim 2: $\{u_n\}$ is uniformly bounded in X_0.
To see this, we notice $u_n\in\mathcal{N}_1^-$ implies $u_n\in\mathcal{N}$ and this in turn implies $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_n),u_n\right\rangle=0$, that is,

$$\|u_n\|^2=|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}+|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}.$$

Since $I_\mu(u_n)\to\beta_1$, using the above equality in the expression of $I_\mu(u_n)$, we get, for n large enough

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{s}{N}\left\|u_n\right\|^2&\leq\beta_1+1+\left(\frac{1}{q+1}-\frac{1}{2^*}\right)|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}\\&\leq C(1+\|u_n\|^{q+1}).\end{aligned}$$

This implies $\{u_n\}$ is uniformly bounded in X_0.

Claim 3: There exists $b>0$ such that $\|u_n^-\|\geq b$ for all $n\geq 1$.
Suppose the claim is not true. Then for each $k\geq 1$, there exists u_{n_k} such that

$$\left\|u^-_{n_k}\right\|<\frac{1}{k}\ \forall\ k\ \geq 1. \tag{4.23}$$

We note that for any $u\in X_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|u\|^2&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}}\frac{|u(x)-u(y)|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}dxdy\\&=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}}\frac{|(u^+(x)-u^+(y))-(u^-(x)-u^-(y))|^2}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}dxdy\\&=\left\|u^+\right\|^2+\left\|u^-\right\|^2+2\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}}\frac{u^+(x)u^-(y)+u^+(y)u^-(x)}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}dxdy\\&\geq\left\|u^+\right\|^2+\left\|u^-\right\|^2\end{aligned} \tag{4.24}$$

By a simple calculation, it follows

$$|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}=|u^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}+|u^-|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}\quad\text{and}\quad|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}=|u^+|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}+|u^-|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}. \tag{4.25}$$

Combining (4.24) and (4.25), we obtain

$$I_\mu(u)\geq I_\mu(u^+)+I_\mu(u^-)\quad\forall\quad u\in X_0. \tag{4.26}$$

Moreover, (4.23) implies $\left\|u^-_{n_k}\right\|\to 0$ and therefore by Sobolev inequality

$$|u^-_{n_k}|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}\to 0,\ \ |u^-_{n_k}|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}\to 0,\quad\text{as}\quad k\to\infty.$$

Consequently, $I_\mu(u^-_{n_k})\to 0$ as $k\to\infty$. As a result, we have

$$\beta_1=I_\mu(u_{n_k})+o(1)\geq I_\mu(u^+_{n_k})+I_\mu(u^-_{n_k})+o(1)=J_\mu(u^+_{n_k})+o(1)\geq\tilde{\alpha}^-_\mu+o(1).$$

This is a contradiction to the hypothesis. Hence claim 3 follows.

Claim 4: $I'_\mu(u_n)\to 0$ in $(X_0)'$ as $n\to\infty$.

Since $u_n \in \mathcal{N}_1^- \subset \mathcal{N}$, By Lemma 4.5 applied to the element u_n, there exists

$$\rho_n := \rho_{u_n} \quad \text{and} \quad g_n := g_{\rho_{u_n}} \tag{4.27}$$

such that

$$g_n(0) = 1, \quad \big(g_n(w)\big)(u_n + w) \in N \quad \forall \quad w \in B_{\rho_n}(0). \tag{4.28}$$

Choose $0 < \tilde{\rho}_n < \rho_n$ such that $\tilde{\rho}_n \to 0$. Let $v \in X_0$ with $||v|| = 1$. Define $v_n := \tilde{\rho}_n v \in B_{\rho_n}(0)$. By taking $w = -v_n$ in (4.28), we get $\big(g_n(-v_n)\big)(u_n - v_n) \in N$. We define $z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} := \big(g_n(-v_n)\big)(u_n - v_n)$. Clearly, $z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} \in \mathcal{N}$.

$$I_\mu(z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}) \geq I_\mu(u_n) - \frac{1}{n} \|u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}\|.$$

This implies,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \|u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}\| &\geq I_\mu(u_n) - I_\mu(z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}) \\ &= \big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} \big\rangle + o(1) \|u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}\| \\ &= \big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), u_n - v_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} \big\rangle + \big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v_n \big\rangle + o(1) \|u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}\| \end{aligned} \tag{4.29}$$

Now,

$$\begin{aligned} u_n - v_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n} &= [1 - \big(g_n(-v_n)\big)](u_n - v_n) \\ &= [g_n(0) - \big(g_n(-v_n)\big)](u_n - v_n) \\ &= \big[\, \big\langle g'_n(0), v_n \big\rangle + o(1)||v_n|| \big](u_n - v_n) \\ &= \tilde{\rho}_n \big[\, \big\langle g'_n(0), v \big\rangle + o(1)||v|| \big](u_n - v_n). \end{aligned} \tag{4.30}$$

Substituting back the above expression into (4.29), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} \|u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}\| \geq \tilde{\rho}_n \big[\, \big\langle g'_n(0), v \big\rangle + o(1)||v|| \big] \big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), u_n - v_n \big\rangle \\ + \tilde{\rho}_n \big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v \big\rangle + o(1) \|u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}\|. \end{aligned} \tag{4.31}$$

Since by Claim 2, $\|u_n\|$ is uniformly bounded, doing the simple calculation as in (4.30), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|u_n - z_{\tilde{\rho}_n}\| &= \big\|u_n - \big(g_n(-v_n)\big)u_n + \big(g_n(-v_n)\big)v_n\big\| \\ &\leq \tilde{\rho}_n |\, \big\langle g'_n(0), v \big\rangle \,| \, \|u_n\| + \tilde{\rho}_n \big(g_n(-v_n)\big) \\ &\leq \tilde{\rho}_n \big[C |\, \big\langle g'_n(0), v \big\rangle \,| + g_n(-v_n)\big]. \end{aligned} \tag{4.32}$$

Substituting (4.32) into (4.31), yields

$$\big[\, \big\langle g'_n(0), v \big\rangle + o(1)||v|| \big] \big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), u_n - v_n \big\rangle + \big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v \big\rangle \leq \big[\frac{1}{n} + o(1)\big][C |\, \big\langle g'_n(0), v \big\rangle \,| + g_n(-v_n)].$$

As $\tilde{\rho}_n \to 0$ we get $u_n - v_n = u_n + o(1)$ in X_0. Moreover by Lemma 7.1, $|\, \langle g'_n(0), v \rangle \,|$ is uniformly bounded . Therefore we have,

$$\big[\, \big\langle g'_n(0), v \big\rangle + o(1)||v|| \big] \big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), u_n \big\rangle + \big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v \big\rangle \leq \frac{C+1}{n}.$$

This implies

$$\big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), v \big\rangle \leq \frac{C}{n} \quad \text{for all} \quad n \geq n_0,$$

since $\big\langle I'_\mu(u_n), u_n \big\rangle = 0$. Letting $n \to \infty$ we have $I'_\mu(u_n) \to 0$ in $(X_0)'$. Hence the claim follows.

Therefore, $\{u_n\}$ is a (PS) sequence of I_μ at level $\beta_1 < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$. From [14, Proposition 4.2], it follows that

$$\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- < \frac{s}{N} S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} - M\mu^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-q-1}} \quad \text{for} \quad \mu \in (0, \mu_*),$$

where $M = \frac{\left(2N-(N-2s)(q+1)\right)(1-q)}{4(q+1)} \left(\frac{(1-q)(N-2s)}{4s}\right)^{\frac{q+1}{2^*-q-1}} |\Omega|$.

Therefore,

$$\beta_1 < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- < \frac{s}{N} S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} - M\mu^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-q-1}}.$$

On the other hand, it follows from the proof of Theorem 1.1 (see (3.4))that I_μ satisfies PS at level c for

$$c < \frac{s}{N} S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} - k\mu^{\frac{2^*}{2^*-q-1}},$$

where k is as in (3.12). By elementary analysis, it follows $k = M$. Therefore there exists $u \in X_0$ such that $u_n \to u$ in X_0. By doing a simple calculation we get $u_n^- \to u^-$ in X_0. Consequently, by Claim 3 $\|u^-\| \geq b$. As $\mathcal{N}_1^-$ is a closed set and $u_n \to u$, we obtain $u \in \mathcal{N}_1^-$, that is, $u^+ \in \mathcal{N}^-$ and $u^+ \neq 0$. Therefore u is a solution of $(\mathcal{P})$ with u^+ and u^- are both nonzero. Hence, u is a sign-changing solution of $(\mathcal{P})$. Define $\tilde{w}_1 := u$. This completes the proof of part (i) of the theorem.

Proof of part (ii) is similar to part (i) and we omit the proof. □

Theorem 4.2. *Let β_1, β_2, $\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$ be defined as in* (4.19) *and* (4.6) *respectively. Assume $\beta_1, \beta_2 \geq \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$. Then there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that for any $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$, I_μ has a sign changing critical point.*

We need the following Proposition to prove the above Theorem 4.2.

Proposition 4.1. *Let $N > 6s$ and $\frac{1}{2}(\frac{N+2s}{N-2s}) < q < 1$. Assume $0 < \mu < min\{\mu_*, \tilde{\mu}\}$, where $\tilde{\mu}$ is as defined in* (4.11) *and $\mu_* > 0$ is chosen such that $\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$ is achieved in $(0, \mu_*)$. Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small , we have*

$$\sup_{a \geq 0,\ b \in \mathbb{R}} I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon) < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- + \frac{s}{N} S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}},$$

where w_1 and u_ε are as in (4.6) *and* (4.5) *respectively.*

To prove the above proposition, we need the following lemmas.

Lemma 4.6. *Let w_1 and μ be as in Proposition 4.1. Then*

$$\sup_{s>0} I_\mu(sw_1) = \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-.$$

Proof. By the definition of $\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$, we have $\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- = \inf_{u \in \mathcal{N}^-} J_\mu(u) = J_\mu(w_1) = I_\mu(w_1)$. In the last equality we have used the fact that $w_1 > 0$. Define $g(s) := I_\mu(sw_1)$. From the proof of Lemma 4.3, it follows that there exists only two critical points of g, namely $t^+(w_1)$ and $t^-(w_1)$ and $\max_{s>0} g(s) = g(t^+(w_1))$. On the other hand $\langle I'_\mu(w_1), v\rangle = 0$ for every $v \in X_0$. Therefore $g'(1) = 0$. This in turn implies either $t^+(w_1) = 1$ or $t^-(w_1) = 1$.
Claim: $t^-(w_1) \neq 1$.
To see this, we note that $t^-(w_1) = 1$ implies $t^-(w_1)w_1 \in \mathcal{N}^-$ as $w_1 \in \mathcal{N}^-$. Also, from Lemma 4.3, we know $t^-(w_1)w_1 \in \mathcal{N}^+$. Thus $\mathcal{N}^+ \cap \mathcal{N}^- \neq \emptyset$, which is a contradiction. Hence the claim follows.
Therefore $t^+(w_1) = 1$ and this completes the proof. □

Lemma 4.7. *Let u_ε be as in (4.5) and μ be as in Proposition 4.1. Then for $\varepsilon > 0$ sufficiently small, we have*

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(tu_\varepsilon) = \frac{s}{N}S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} + C\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-2s)N}{2s}} - k_8|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}.$$

Proof. Define $\tilde{\phi}(t) = \frac{t^2}{2}||u_\varepsilon||^2 - \frac{t^{2^*}}{2^*}|u_\varepsilon|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}$. Thus $I_\mu(tu_\varepsilon) = \tilde{\phi}(t) - \mu\frac{t^{q+1}}{q+1}|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}$. On the other hand, applying the analysis done in Lemma 4.3 to u_ε, we obtain there exists $(t_0)_\varepsilon = \left(\frac{(1-q)\|u_\varepsilon\|^2}{(2^*-1-q)|u_\varepsilon|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{N-2s}{4s}} < t_\varepsilon^+$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(tu_\varepsilon) = \sup_{t\geq 0} I_\mu(tu_\varepsilon) = I_\mu(t_\varepsilon^+u_\varepsilon) &= \tilde{\phi}(t_\varepsilon^+) - \mu\frac{(t_\varepsilon^+)^{q+1}}{q+1}|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}\\ &\leq \sup_{t\geq 0}\tilde{\phi}(t) - \mu\frac{(t_0)_\varepsilon^{q+1}}{q+1}|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}.\end{aligned}$$

Substituting the value of $(t_0)_\varepsilon$ and using Sobolev inequality (4.2), we have

$$\mu\frac{(t_0)_\varepsilon^{q+1}}{q+1} \geq \frac{\mu}{q+1}\left(\frac{1-q}{2^*-q-1}S_s\right)^{\frac{(N-2s)(q+1)}{4s}} = k_8.$$

Consequently,

$$\sup_{t\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(tu_\varepsilon) \leq \sup_{t\geq 0}\tilde{\phi}(t) - k_8|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}. \tag{4.33}$$

Using elementary analysis, it is easy to check that $\tilde{\phi}$ attains it's maximum at the point $\tilde{t}_0 = \left(\frac{||u_\varepsilon||^2}{|u_\varepsilon|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}}$ and $\tilde{\phi}(t_0) = \frac{s}{N}\left(\frac{||u_\varepsilon||^2}{|u_\varepsilon|^2_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{N}{2s}}$. Moreover, from Proposition 21 and Proposition 22 of [25], it follows

$$||u_\varepsilon||^2 = S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} + O(\varepsilon^{N-2s}), \quad \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|u_\varepsilon|^{2^*}dx = S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} + O(\varepsilon^N).$$

As a result,

$$\tilde{\phi}(t_0) \leq \frac{s}{N}\left[\frac{S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} + O(\varepsilon^{N-2s})}{(S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} + O(\varepsilon^N))^{\frac{2}{2^*}}}\right]^{\frac{N}{2s}} \leq \frac{s}{N}\left[\frac{S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} + O(\varepsilon^{N-2s})}{(S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}})^{\frac{2}{2^*}}}\right]^{\frac{N}{2s}} \leq \frac{s}{N}S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} + C\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-2s)N}{2s}}. \tag{4.34}$$

In the last inequality we have used the fact that $\varepsilon > 0$ is arbitrary small. Substituting back (4.34) into (4.33), completes the proof. □

Proof of Proposition 4.1: Note that, for fixed a and b, $I_\mu\big(\eta(aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon)\big) \to -\infty$ as $|n| \to \infty$. Therefore $\sup_{a\geq 0,\ b\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon)$ exists and supremum will be attained in $a^2 + b^2 \leq R^2$, for some large $R > 0$. Thus it is enough to estimate $I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon)$ in $\{(a,b) \in \mathbb{R}^+ \times \mathbb{R} : a^2 + b^2 \leq R^2\}$. Using elementary inequality, there exists $d(m) > 0$ such that

$$|a+b|^m \geq |a|^m + |b|^m - d(|a|^{m-1}|b| + |a||b|^{m-1}) \quad \forall \quad a,\ b \in \mathbb{R},\ m > 1. \tag{4.35}$$

Therefore, $a^2+b^2 \leq R^2$ implies

$$\begin{aligned} I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon) &\leq \frac{1}{2}||aw_1||^2 - ab\langle w_1, u_\varepsilon\rangle + \frac{1}{2}||bu_\varepsilon||^2 - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |aw_1|^{2^*}dx - \frac{1}{2^*}\int_\Omega |bu_\varepsilon|^{2^*}dx \\ &- \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega |aw_1|^{q+1}dx - \frac{\mu}{q+1}\int_\Omega |bu_\varepsilon|^{q+1}dx \\ &+ C\left(\int_\Omega |aw_1|^{2^*-1}|bu_\varepsilon|dx + \int_\Omega |aw_1||bu_\varepsilon|^{2^*-1}dx\right) \\ &+ C\left(\int_\Omega |aw_1|^{q}|bu_\varepsilon|dx + \int_\Omega |aw_1||bu_\varepsilon|^{q}dx\right) \\ &= I_\mu(aw_1) + I_\mu(bu_\varepsilon) - ab\mu\int_\Omega |w_1|^{q-1}w_1u_\varepsilon dx - ab\int_\Omega |w_1|^{2^*-2}w_1u_\varepsilon dx \\ &+ C\left(\int_\Omega |w_1|^{2^*-1}|u_\varepsilon|dx + \int_\Omega |w_1||u_\varepsilon|^{2^*-1}dx\right) \\ &+ C\left(\int_\Omega |w_1|^{q}|u_\varepsilon|dx + \int_\Omega |w_1||u_\varepsilon|^{q}dx\right). \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemmas 4.1, 4.6 and 4.7 we estimate in $a^2+b^2 \leq R^2$,

$$I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon) \leq \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- + \frac{s}{N}S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} - k_8|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1} + C(\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-2s)N}{2s}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{(N-2s)q}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{N+2s}{4}}).$$

Since $N > 2s$ and $q \in (0,1)$, clearly $\varepsilon^{(\frac{N-2s}{4})q}$ is the dominating term among all the terms inside the bracket. For the term $k_8|u_\varepsilon|^{q+1}$, we invoke Lemma 4.2. Therefore when $\frac{2s}{N-2s} < q < 1$, we have

$$I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon) \leq \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- + \frac{s}{N}S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}} - k_9\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-(\frac{N-2s}{4})(q+1)} + C(\varepsilon^{\frac{(N-2s)N}{2s}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{N-2s}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{(N-2s)q}{4}} + \varepsilon^{\frac{N+2s}{4}})$$

This in turn implies, when $\frac{1}{2}(\frac{N+2s}{N-2s}) < q < 1$ and $N > 6s$, $\varepsilon^{\frac{N}{2}-(\frac{N-2s}{4})(q+1)}$ should be the dominating one among all the ε terms and hence in this case, taking $\varepsilon > 0$ to be small enough, we obtain

$$\sup_{a\geq 0, b\in\mathbb{R}} I_\mu(aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon) < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- + \frac{s}{N}S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}}.$$

□

Proof of Theorem 4.2: Define $\mu_0 := min\{\tilde{\mu}, \mu_*\}$ and

$$c_2 : \inf_{u\in\mathcal{N}_*^-} I_\mu(u), \tag{4.36}$$

where

$$\mathcal{N}_*^- := \mathcal{N}_1^- \cap \mathcal{N}_2^-. \tag{4.37}$$

Let $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$. Using Ekland's variational principle and similar to the proof of Theorem 4.1, we obtain a sequence $\{u_n\} \in \mathcal{N}_*^-$ satisfying

$$I_\mu(u_n) \to c_2, \quad I'_\mu(u_n) \to 0 \quad \text{in} \quad (X_0)'.$$

Thus $\{u_n\}$ is a (PS) sequence at level c_2. From Lemma 4.8, it follows that there exists $a > 0$ and $b \in R$ such that $aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}_*^-$. Therefore Proposition 4.1 yields

$$c_2 < \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- + \frac{s}{N}S_s^{\frac{N}{2s}}. \tag{4.38}$$

Claim 1: There exists two positive constants c, C such that $0 < c \leq \|u_n^\pm\| \leq C$.
To see this, we note that $\{u_n\} \subset \mathcal{N}_*^- \subset \mathcal{N}_1^-$. Therefore using (4.24), Claim 2 and Claim 3 of the proof of Theorem 4.1, we have $\|u_n^\pm\| \leq C$ and $\|u_n^-\| \geq c$. To show $\|u_n^+\| \geq a$ for

some $a > 0$, we use method of contradiction. Assume up to a subsequence $\|u_n^+\| \to 0$ as $n \to \infty$. This together with Sobolev embedding implies $|u_n^+|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \to 0$. On the other hand, $u_n^+ \in \mathcal{N}^-$ implies $(1-q)\|u_n^+\|^2 - (2^*-q-1)|u_n^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} < 0$. Therefore by (4.2), we have

$$S_s \leq \frac{\|u_n^+\|^2}{|u_n^+|^2_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}} < \frac{2^*-q-1}{1-q}|u_n^+|^{2^*-2}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)},$$

which is a contradiction to the fact that $|u_n^+|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \to 0$. Hence the claim follows.

Going to a subsequence if necessary we have

$$u_n^+ \rightharpoonup \eta_1, \ u_n^- \rightharpoonup \eta_2 \quad \text{in} \quad X_0. \tag{4.39}$$

Claim 2: $\eta_1 \not\equiv 0, \ \eta_2 \not\equiv 0$.
Suppose not, that is $\eta_1 \equiv 0$. Then by compact embedding, $u_n^+ \to 0$ in $L^{q+1}(\Omega)$. Moreover, $u_n^+ \in \mathcal{N}^- \subset \mathcal{N}$, implies $\left\langle I'_\mu(u_n^+), u_n^+ \right\rangle = 0$. As a consequence,

$$\left\|u_n^+\right\|^2 - |u_n^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} = \mu|u_n^+|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} = o(1).$$

So we have $|u_n^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} = \|u_n^+\|^2 + o(1)$. This together with $\|u_n^+\| \geq c$ implies

$$\frac{|u_n^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}{\left\|u_n^+\right\|^2} \geq 1 + o(1).$$

This along with Sobolev embedding gives $|u_n^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \geq S_s^{N/2s} + o(1)$. Thus we have,

$$I_\mu(u_n^+) = \frac{1}{2}\left\|u_n^+\right\|^2 - \frac{1}{2^*}|u_n^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} + o(1) \geq \frac{s}{N}S_s^{N/2s} + o(1). \tag{4.40}$$

Moreover, $u_n \in \mathcal{N}_*^-$ implies $-u_n^- \in \mathcal{N}^-$. Therefore using the given condition on β_2, we get

$$I_\mu(-u_n^-) \geq \beta_2 \geq \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-. \tag{4.41}$$

Also it follows $I_\mu(u_n^+) + I_\mu(-u_n^-) \leq I_\mu(u_n) = c_2 + o(1)$ (see (4.26)). Combining this along with (4.41) and (4.38), we obtain

$$I_\mu(u_n^+) \leq c_2 - \tilde{\alpha}_\mu^- + o(1) < \frac{s}{N}S_s^{N/2s},$$

which is a contradiction to (4.40). Therefore, $\eta_1 \neq 0$. Similarly, $\eta_2 \neq 0$ and this proves the claim.

Set $w_2 := \eta_1 - \eta_2$.
Claim 3: $w_2^+ = \eta_1$ and $w_2^- = \eta_2$ a.e..
To see the claim we observe that $\eta_1\eta_2 = 0$ a.e. in Ω. Indeed,

$$\begin{aligned} |\int_\Omega \eta_1\eta_2 dx| &= |\int_\Omega (u_n^+ - \eta_1)u_n^- dx + \int_\Omega \eta_1(u_n^- - \eta_2)dx| \\ &\leq |u_n^+ - \eta_1|_{L^2(\Omega)}|u_n^-|_{L^2(\Omega)} + |\eta_1|_{L^2(\Omega)}|u_n^- - \eta_2|_{L^2(\Omega)} \end{aligned} \tag{4.42}$$

By compact embedding we have $u_n^+ \to \eta_1$ and $u_n^- \to \eta_2$ in $L^2(\Omega)$. Therefore using claim 1, we pass the limit in (4.42) and obtain $\int_\Omega \eta_1\eta_2 dx = 0$. Moreover by (4.39), $\eta_1, \ \eta_2 \geq 0$ a.e.. Hence $\eta_1\eta_2 = 0$ a.e. in Ω. We have $w_2^+ - w_2^- = w_2 = \eta_1 - \eta_2$. It is easy to check that $w_2^+ \leq \eta_1$ and $w_2^- \leq \eta_2$. To show that equality holds a.e. we apply the method of contradiction. Suppose, there exists $E \in \Omega$ such that $|E| > 0$ and $0 \leq w_2^+(x) < \eta_1(x) \ \forall \ x \in E$. Therefore $\eta_2 = 0$ a.e. in E by the observation that we made. Hence $w_2^+(x) - w_2^-(x) = \eta_1(x)$ a.e. in E. Clearly $w_2^-(x) \not> 0$ a.e., otherwise $w_2^+(x) = 0$ a.e. and that would imply

$\eta_1(x) = -w_2^-(x) < 0$ a.e, which is not possible since $\eta_1 > 0$ in E. Thus $w_2^-(x) = 0$. This yields $\eta_1(x) = w_2^+(x)$ a.e. in E, which is a contradiction. Thus the claim follows.

Therefore w_2 is sign changing in Ω and $u_n \rightharpoonup w_2$ in X_0. Moreover, $I'_\mu(u_n) \to 0$ in $(X_0)'$ implies

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2N}} \frac{(u_n(x)-u_n(y))(\phi(x)-\phi(y))}{|x-y|^{N+2s}}dxdy - \mu\int_\Omega |u_n|^{q-1}u_n\phi dx - \int_\Omega |u_n|^{2^*-2}u_n\phi dx = o(1),$$

for every $\phi \in X_0$. Passing the limit using Vitali's convergence theorem via Hölder's inequality we obtain $\langle I'_\mu(w_2), \phi\rangle = 0$. As a result, w_2 is a sign changing weak solution to $(\mathcal{P})$. □

Lemma 4.8. *Let u_ε be as defined in* (4.5) *and w_1 be a positive solution of $(\mathcal{P})$ for which $\tilde{\alpha}_\mu^-$ is achieved, when $\mu \in (0, \mu_*)$. Then there exists $a,\ b \in \mathbb{R},\ a \geq 0$ such that $aw_1 - bu_\varepsilon \in \mathcal{N}_*^-$, where $\mathcal{N}_*^-$ is defined as in* (4.37).

Proof. We will show that there exists $a > 0,\ b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$a(w_1 - bu_\varepsilon)^+ \in \mathcal{N}^- \quad \text{and} \quad -a(w_1 - bu_\varepsilon)^- \in N^-.$$

Let us denote $\bar{r}_1 = \inf_{x\in\Omega} \frac{w_1(x)}{u_\varepsilon(x)},\ \bar{r}_2 = \sup_{x\in\Omega} \frac{w_1(x)}{u_\varepsilon(x)}$.
As both w_1 and u_ε are positive in Ω, we have $\bar{r}_1 \geq 0$ and $\bar{r}_2$ can be $+\infty$. Let $r \in (\bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_2)$. Then $w_1, u_\varepsilon \in X_0$ implies $(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon) \in X_0$ and $(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+ \not\equiv 0$. Otherwise, $(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+ \equiv 0$ would imply $\bar{r}_2 \leq r$, which is not possible. Define $v_r := w_1 - ru_\varepsilon$. Then $0 \not\equiv v_r^+ \in X_0$ (since for any $u \in X_0$, we have $|u| \in X_0$). Similarly, $0 \not\equiv v_r^- \in X_0$. Therefore, by lemma 4.3 there exists $0 < s^+(r) < s^-(r)$ such that $s^+(r)v_r^+ \in \mathcal{N}^-$, and $-s^-(r)(v_r^-) \in \mathcal{N}^-$. Let us consider the functions $s^\pm : \mathbb{R} \to (0, \infty)$ defined as above.
Claim: The functions $r \mapsto s^\pm(r)$ are continuous and

$$\lim_{r\to\bar{r}_1^+} s^+(r) = t^+(v^+_{\bar{r}_1}) \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{r\to\bar{r}_2^-} s^+(r) = +\infty,$$

where the function t^+ is same as defined in lemma 4.3.
To see the claim, choose $r_0 \in (\bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_2)$ and $\{r_n\}_{n\geq 1} \subset (\bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_2)$ such that $r_n \to r_0$ as $n \to \infty$. We need to show that $s^+(r_n) \to s^+(r_0)$ as $n \to \infty$. Corresponding to r_n and r_0, we have $v^+_{r_n} = (w_1 - r_n u_\varepsilon)^+$ and $v^+_{r_0} = (w_1 - r_0 u_\varepsilon)^+$. By lemma 4.3. we note that $s^+(r) = t^+(v_r^+)$. Let us define the function

$$\begin{aligned} F(s,r) &:= s^{1-q}\left\|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+\right\|^2 - s^{2^*-q-1}|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} - \mu|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \\ &= \phi(s,r) - \mu|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}, \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\phi := s^{1-q}\left\|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+\right\|^2 - s^{2^*-q-1}|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)},$$

is defined similar to (4.12) (see Lemma 4.3). Doing the similar calculation as in lemma 4.3, we obtain that for any fixed r, the function $F(s,r)$ has only two zeros $s = t^+(v_r^+)$ and $s = t^-(v_r^+)$ (see (4.16)). Consequently $s^+(r)$ is the largest 0 of $F(s,r)$ for any fixed r. As $r_n \to r_0$ we have $v^+_{r_n} \to v^+_{r_0}$ in X_0 . Indeed, by straight forward computation it follows $v_{r_n} \to v_{r_0}$ in X_0. Therefore $|v_{r_n}| \to |v_{r_0}|$ in X_0. This in turn implies $v^+_{r_n} \to v^+_{r_0}$ in X_0. Hence $||v^+_{r_n}||_{X_0} \to ||v^+_{r_0}||_{X_0}$. Moreover by Sobolev inequality, we have $|v^+_{r_n}|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \to |v^+_{r_0}|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}$ and $|v^+_{r_n}|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \to |v^+_{r_0}|_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)}$. As a result, we have $F(s,r_n) \to F(s,r_0)$ uniformly. Therefore an elementary analysis yields $s^+(r_n) \to s^+(r_0)$.

Moreover, $\bar{r}_2 \geq \frac{w_1}{u_\varepsilon}$ implies $w_1 - \bar{r}_2 u_\varepsilon \leq 0$. As a consequence $r \to \bar{r}_2^-$ implies $(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+ \to 0$ pointwise. Moreover, since $|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|_{L^\infty(\Omega)} \leq |w_1|_{L^\infty(\Omega)}$, using dominated convergence theorem we have $|(w_1 - ru_\varepsilon)^+|_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \to 0$. From the analysis in Lemma 4.3,

for any r, we also have $s^+(r) > t_0(v_r^+)$, where function t_0 is defined as in (4.13), which is the maximum point of $\phi(.,r)$. Therefore it is enough to show that $\lim_{r\to\bar{r}_2^-} t_0(v_r^+) = \infty$. Applying (4.2) in the definition of $t_0(v_r^+)$ we get

$$t_0(v_r^+) = \left(\frac{(1-q)||v_r^+||^2}{(2^*-1-q)|v_r^+|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}} \geq \left(\frac{S_s(1-q)}{2^*-1-q}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}} |v_r^+|^{-1}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}.$$

Thus $\lim_{r\to\bar{r}_2^-} t_0(v_r^+) = \infty$.

Similarly proceeding as above we can show that if $r \to \bar{r}_1^-$ then $v_r^+ \to v_{\bar{r}_1}$ and $\lim_{r\to\bar{r}_1^+} s^+(r) = t^+(v_{\bar{r}_1}^+)$ and

$$\lim_{r\to r_1^+} s^-(r) = +\infty, \ \lim_{r\to r_2^-} s^-(r) = t^+(v_r^-) < +\infty.$$

The continuity of $s^\pm$ implies that there exists $b \in (\bar{r}_1, \bar{r}_2)$ such that $s^+(r) = s^-(r) = a > 0$. Therefore,

$$a(w_1 - bu_\varepsilon^+) \in \mathcal{N}^- \quad \text{and} \quad -a(w_1 - bu_\varepsilon^-) \in \mathcal{N}^-,$$

that is, the function $a(w_1 - bu_\varepsilon) \in \mathcal{N}_*^-$ and this completes the proof.

□

Proof of Theorem 1.2: Define $\mu^* = \min\{\mu_*, \tilde{\mu}, \mu_0, \mu_1\}$. Combining Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2, we complete the proof of this theorem for $\mu \in (0, \mu^*)$. □

5. **Proof of Theorem 1.3**

Before starting the proof we like to remark that when $\mu \geq 0$, $\lambda > 0$, Theorem 1.3 (a) also follows from [11, Theorem 1]. Here we give a proof which covers the entire range mentioned in Theorem 1.3.

Proof. (a)We assume $\mu \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\lambda > 0$. We prove part (a) using Fountain theorem 2.1. Energy functional corresponding to $(\mathcal{P}_K)$ is defined by I_μ^λ (see (1.7)). We need to verify that I_μ^λ satisfies (A1)-(A4) of Theorem 2.1. We choose X_j, Y_j, Z_j as in (2.1) and $G := \mathbb{Z}/2$. Therefore, (A1) is satisfied.

Next to check (A2) holds, we observe that,

$$I_\mu^\lambda(u) \leq \frac{1}{2}||u||_{X_0}{}^2 + \frac{|\mu|}{q+1}|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} - \frac{\lambda}{p+1}|u|^{p+1}_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}.$$

Since on the finite dimensional space Y_k all the norms are equivalent, $\lambda > 0$ and $1 < q+1 < 2 < p+1$, it is easy to see that (A2) is satisfied if we choose $\rho_k > 0$ large enough.

To see (A3) holds, we observe that

$$I_\mu^\lambda(u) \geq \frac{\|u\|^2_{X_0}}{2} - \frac{|\mu|}{q+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx - \frac{\lambda}{p+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{p+1}dx. \tag{5.1}$$

Applying Hölder inequality followed by Youngs inequality we obtain

$$\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx \leq \frac{q+1}{p+1}\int_\Omega |u|^{p+1}dx + \frac{p-q}{p+1}|\Omega|.$$

Substituting back in (5.1), we obtain

$$I_\mu^\lambda(u) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|^2_{X_0} - \left(\frac{|\mu|}{p+1} + \frac{\lambda}{p+1}\right)\int_\Omega |u|^{p+1} - \frac{(p-q)|\mu|}{(p+1)(q+1)}|\Omega|.$$

Define

$$\beta_k := \sup_{u\in Z_k,\ \|u\|_{X_0}=1} |u|_{L^{p+1}(\Omega)}.$$

Hence on Z_k we have

$$I_\mu^\lambda(u) \geq \frac{1}{2}\|u\|_{X_0}^2 - \frac{(\lambda+|\mu|)\beta_k^{p+1}}{p+1}\|u\|^{p+1} - \frac{(p-q)|\mu|}{(p+1)(q+1)}|\Omega|.$$

Choosing $r_k^{1-p} = (\lambda+|\mu|)\beta_k^{p+1}$, we have, for $u \in Z_k$ and $\|u\|_{X_0} = r_k$,

$$I_\mu^\lambda(u) \geq \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1}{p+1}\right) r_k^2 - \frac{(p-q)|\mu|}{(p+1)(q+1)}|\Omega|.$$

Lemma 2.1 yields $\beta_k \to 0$ and hence $r_k \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Therefore (A3) is satisfied.

In order to verify (A4), let $\{u_n\} \subset X_0$ such that

$$I_\mu^\lambda(u_n) \to c \quad \text{and} \quad (I_\mu^\lambda)'(u_n) \to 0 \quad \text{in} \quad (X_0)',$$

where $c > 0$ and $(X_0)'$ denotes the dual space of X_0. Following the same calculation as in Theorem 1.1, we get $\{u_n\}$ is bounded in X_0 and there exists $u \in X_0$ such that up to a subsequence $u_n \rightharpoonup u$ in X_0 and $u_n \to u$ in $L^r(\mathbb{R}^N)$ for every $r \in [1, 2^*)$. Since $\left\langle (I_\mu^\lambda)'(u_n), v\right\rangle = 0$ for every v in X_0, passing the limit using Vitali's convergence theorem, it follows $\left\langle (I_\mu^\lambda)'(u), v\right\rangle = 0$ for every v in X_0. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} o(1) = \left\langle (I_\mu^\lambda)'(u_n) - (I_\mu^\lambda)'(u), u_n - u\right\rangle &= \|u_n - u\|^2 \\ &- \mu\int_\Omega (|u_n|^{q-1}u_n - |u|^{q-1}u)(u_n - u)dx \\ &- \lambda\int_\Omega (|u_n|^{p-1}u_n - |u|^{p-1}u)(u_n - u)dx. \end{aligned}$$

Again, passing the limit by Vitali, we obtain $u_n \to u$ in X_0. Hence, (A4) is satisfied. Therefore by Theorem 2.1, it follows that $(\mathcal{P}_K)$ has a sequence of nontrivial solution $\{w_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ such that $I_\mu^\lambda(w_k) \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$. Furthermore, if $\lambda > 0,\ \mu \geq 0$, then $I_\mu^\lambda(w_k) \leq ||w_k||^2$ and thus $\|w_k\|_{X_0} \to \infty$ as $k \to \infty$.

(b) This part follows from Theorem 2.2. We can proceed along the same line of proof of Theorem 1.1 to show (D1)-(D3) of Theorem 2.2 are satisfied. To check the assertion (D4), we consider a sequence $\{u_{r_j}\} \subset X_0$ such that as

$$\{u_{r_j}\} \in Y_{r_j}, \quad I_\mu^\lambda(u_{r_j}) \to c, \quad (I_\mu^\lambda)|'_{Y_{r_j}}(u_{r_j}) \to 0 \quad \text{as} \quad r_j \to \infty.$$

We can prove exactly in the same way as in Theorem 1.1 that $\{u_n\}$ is a bounded PS sequence in X_0 at level c. Therefore, it is easy to conclude, as in part (a) that u_n converges strongly in X_0. Hence (D4) is also satisfied and as a result by Theorem 2.2, we conclude $(\mathcal{P}_K)$ has a sequence of nontrivial solutions $\{v_k\}_{k\geq 1}$ such that $c_k := I_\mu^\lambda(v_k) < 0$ and $c_k \to 0$ as $k \to \infty$. Using $\left\langle (I_\mu^\lambda)'(u_k), u_k\right\rangle = 0$ in the definition of $I_\mu^\lambda(u_k)$, we have

$$\mu\left(1 - \frac{2}{q+1}\right)\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx + \lambda\left(1 - \frac{2}{p+1}\right)\int_\Omega |u|^{p+1}dx = 2c_k < 0.$$

Therefore, if $\mu > 0,\ \lambda \leq 0$, then

$$0 \leq -\lambda\left(1 - \frac{2}{p+1}\right)\int_\Omega |u|^{p+1}dx = -2c_k + \mu\left(1 - \frac{2}{q+1}\right)\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx,$$

since $1 < q+1 < 2 < p+1$. This implies, $-2c_k \geq -\mu\big(1-\frac{2}{q+1}\big)\int_\Omega |u|^{q+1}dx$. Hence $\int_\Omega |u_k|^{q+1}dx \leq \frac{-2c_kq}{\mu(2-q)}$. Moreover, $\big\langle (I_\mu^\lambda)'(u_k), u_k\big\rangle = 0$ implies

$$||u_k||^2 = \mu\int_\Omega |u_k|^{q+1}dx + \lambda\int_\Omega |u_k|^{p+1}dx \leq \mu\int_\Omega |u_k|^{q+1}dx \leq \frac{-2c_kq}{2-q} \to 0,$$

as $k\to\infty$. This completes the proof. □

6. **A related variational problem**

In this section we consider a related problem that can be solved by doing the similar type of analysis that we did in Section 3. More precisely we consider the following problem:

$$\begin{cases} (-\Delta)^s u - \frac{\alpha u}{|x|^{2s}} = \frac{|u|^{2^*(t)-2}u}{|x|^t} + \mu|u|^{q-1}u & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N\setminus\Omega, \end{cases} \tag{6.1}$$

where $N > 2s$, Ω is an open, bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with smooth boundary, $0 \leq t < 2s$, $0 < q < 1$, $2^*(t) = \frac{2(N-t)}{N-2s}$, $\alpha < \alpha_H := 2^{2s}\frac{\Gamma^2(\frac{N+2s}{4})}{\Gamma^2(\frac{N-2s}{4})}$ is the best fractional Hardy constant on $\mathbb{R}^N$. Thanks to the following fractional Hardy inequality :

$$\alpha_H\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}\frac{|u|^2}{|x|^{2s}}dx \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u|^2dx, \tag{6.2}$$

which was proved by Herbst [21] (see also [23]), $\left(\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u|^2dx - \alpha\int_\Omega\frac{|u(x)|^2}{|x|^{2s}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2}}$ is a norm equivalent to the norm (1.6) in $X_0(\Omega)$. Interpolating the above Hardy inequality with (4.2) and followed by simple calculation, we have the following fractional Hardy-Sobolev inequality

$$C\left(\int_\Omega\frac{|u|^{2^*(t)}}{|x|^t}dx\right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(t)}} \leq \int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u|^2dx - \alpha\int_\Omega\frac{|u(x)|^2}{|x|^{2s}}.$$

Therefore we can define the quotient $S_s(\alpha) > 0$ as follows

$$S_s(\alpha) := \inf_{u\in X_0,\ u\neq 0}\frac{\displaystyle\int_{\mathbb{R}^N}|(-\Delta)^{\frac{s}{2}}u|^2dx - \alpha\int_\Omega\frac{|u(x)|^2}{|x|^{2s}}}{\displaystyle\left(\int_\Omega\frac{|u|^{2^*(t)}}{|x|^t}dx\right)^{\frac{2}{2^*(t)}}}. \tag{6.3}$$

The following theorem regarding existence of infinitely many nontrivial solutions for fractional Hardy-Sobolev type equation can be proved in the spirit of theorem 1.1.

Theorem 6.1. *Let Ω be a bounded domain in $\mathbb{R}^N$ with smooth boundary, $N > 2s$. Then there exists $\mu^* > 0$ such that for all $\mu \in (0,\mu^*)$, problem* (6.1) *has a sequence of nontrivial solutions $\{u_n\}_{n\geq 1}$ such that $I(u_n) < 0$ and $I(u_n) \to 0$ as $n\to\infty$ where $I(.)$ is the corresponding energy functional associated with* (6.1).

In order to prove this theorem one essentially needs to verify an argument similar to (3.4), where RHS of (3.4) should be replaced by $\frac{2s-t}{2(N-t)}S_s(\alpha)^{\frac{N-t}{2s-t}} - k\mu^{\frac{2^*(t)}{2^*(t)-q-1}}$ and this would follow by the similar type of arguments as in the proof of Theorem 1.1.

7. Appendix

Lemma 7.1. *Let g_n be as in (4.27) in the Theorem 4.1 and $v \in X_0$ such that $||v|| = 1$. Then there exists $\mu_1 > 0$ such that, $\mu \in (0, \mu_1)$ implies $\langle g_n'(0), v\rangle$ is uniformly bounded in X_0.*

Proof. In view of lemma 4.5 we have,

$$\left\langle g_n'(0), v\right\rangle = \frac{2\left\langle u_n, v\right\rangle - 2^*\displaystyle\int_\Omega |u_n|^{2^*-2}u_n v - (q+1)\mu\int_\Omega |u_n|^{q-1}u_n v}{(1-q)\left\|u_n\right\|^2 - (2^*-q-1)|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}.$$

Using Claim 2 in theorem 4.1, there exists $C > 0$ such that $\|u_n\| \leq C$ for all $n \geq 1$. Therefore applying Hölder inequality followed by (4.2), we have $|\left\langle g_n'(0), v\right\rangle| \leq \frac{C\|v\|}{|(1-q)\|u_n\|^2 - (2^*-q-1)|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}|}$. Hence it is enough to show

$$|(1-q)\left\|u_n\right\|^2 - (2^*-q-1)|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}| > C,$$

for some $C > 0$ and n large. Suppose it does not hold. Then up to a subsequence

$$(1-q)\left\|u_n\right\|^2 - (2^*-q-1)|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} = o(1) \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty.$$

Hence,

$$\|u_n\|^2 = \frac{2^*-q-1}{1-q}|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} + o(1) \quad \text{as} \quad n \to \infty. \tag{7.1}$$

Combining the above expression along with the fact that $u_n \in \mathcal{N}$, we obtain

$$\mu|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} = \frac{2-2^*}{1-q}\left|u_n\right|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} + o(1) = \frac{2^*-2}{2^*-1-q}\left\|u_n\right\|^2 + o(1). \tag{7.2}$$

After applying Hölder inequality and followed by (4.2), expression (7.2) yields

$$\|u_n\| \leq \left(\mu\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*-2}|\Omega|^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}}S_s^{-\frac{q+1}{2}}\right)^{\frac{1}{1-q}} + o(1). \tag{7.3}$$

Combining (4.24) and Claim 3 in the proof of Theorem 4.1, we have $\|u_n\| \geq b$, for some $b > 0$. Therefore from (7.1) we get

$$|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \geq C \quad \text{for some constant } C > 0, \text{ and } n \text{ large enough.} \tag{7.4}$$

Define $\psi_\mu : \mathcal{N} \to \mathbb{R}$ as follows:

$$\psi_\mu(u) = k_0\left(\frac{\|u\|^{2(2^*-1)}}{|u|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}} - \mu|u|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)},$$

where $k_0 = \left(\frac{1-q}{2^*-q-1}\right)^{\frac{N+2s}{4s}}\left(\frac{2^*-2}{1-q}\right)$. Simplifying $\psi_\mu(u_n)$ using (7.2), we obtain

$$\psi_\mu(u_n) = k_0\left[\left(\frac{2^*-q-1}{1-q}\right)^{2^*-1}\frac{|u_n|^{(2^*-1)2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}{|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right]^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}} - \frac{2^*-2}{1-q}|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} + o(1) = o(1). \tag{7.5}$$

On the other hand, using Hölder inequality in the definition of $\psi_\mu(u_n)$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\psi_\mu(u_n) &= k_0\left(\frac{\|u_n\|^{2(2^*-1)}}{|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}} - \mu|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{q+1}(\Omega)} \\ &\geq k_0\left(\frac{\|u_n\|^{2(2^*-1)}}{|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}} - \mu|\Omega|^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}}|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \\ &= |u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}\left\{k_0\left(\frac{\|u_n\|^{2(2^*-1)}}{|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}}\frac{1}{|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}} - \mu|\Omega|^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}}\right\}. \qquad (7.6)\end{aligned}$$

Using (4.2) and (7.3), we simplify the term $\left(\frac{\|u_n\|^{2(2^*-1)}}{|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}}\frac{1}{|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}$ and obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\left(\frac{\|u_n\|^{2(2^*-1)}}{|u_n|^{2^*}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}}\right)^{\frac{1}{2^*-2}}\frac{1}{|u_n|^{q+1}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)}} &\geq S_s^{\frac{N+2s}{4s}}|u_n|^{-q}_{L^{2^*}(\Omega)} \\ &\geq S_s^{\frac{N+2s(q+1)}{4s}}||u_n||^{-q} \\ &\geq S_s^{\frac{N+2s(q+1)}{4s}}\left(\mu\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*-2}|\Omega|^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}}S_s^{-\frac{q+1}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{q}{1-q}} \qquad (7.7)\end{aligned}$$

Substituting back (7.7) into (7.6) and using (7.4), we obtain

$$\psi_\mu(u_n) \geq C^{q+1}\left[k_0 S^{\frac{N+2s(q+1)}{4s}+(\frac{1+q}{1-q}\frac{q}{2})}\mu^{-\frac{q}{1-q}}\big(\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*-2}|\Omega|^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}}\big)^{-\frac{q}{1-q}} - \mu|\Omega|^{\frac{2^*-q-1}{2^*}}\right] \geq d_0,$$

for some $d_0 > 0$, n large and $\mu < \mu_1$, where $\mu_1 = \mu_1(k, s, q, N, |\Omega|)$. This is a contradiction to (7.5). Hence the lemma follows. □

8. **Concluding remarks and questions**

We finish the paper with some remarks and related open questions. We have proved existence of infinitely many nontrivial solutions of the following problem

$$\begin{cases}(-\Delta)^s u = \mu|u|^{q-1}u + |u|^{p-1}u = 0 & \text{in } \Omega, \\ u = 0 & \text{in } \mathbb{R}^N \setminus \Omega,\end{cases}$$

where $0 < s < 1$, $0 < q < 1 < p \leq 2^* - 1$, $\mu > 0$, $N > 2s$ and existence of at least one sign changing solution when $p = 2^* - 1$, $\frac{1}{2}(\frac{N+2s}{N-2s}) < q < 1$ and $N > 6s$. Also it is known (see [5, 6, 10, 14]) that there exists $\mu_0 > 0$ such that, for every $\mu \in (0, \mu_0)$, the above problem admits at least two positive solutions. An interesting question here is, can we say anything about exact number of positive solutions at least in some bounded domain, for example in the unit ball in $\mathbb{R}^N$? This fact is known in the case of local operator (see [1, 17, 22, 29]). Answer to this question can shed some light on the multiplicity questions of sign-changing solutions.

Acknowledgement The first author is supported by the INSPIRE research grant DST/INSPIRE 04/2013/000152 and the second author is supported by the NBHM grant 2/39(12)/2014/RD-II.

References

[1] Adimurthi; Pacella, F; Yadava, S. L., *On the number of positive solutions of some semilinear Dirichlet problems in a ball.* Differential Integral Equations 10 (1997), no. 6, 1157-1170.

[2] Ambrosetti, A.; Brezis, H; Cerami, G.,*Combined effects of concave and convex nonlinearities in some elliptic problems.* J. Funct. Analysis 122 (1994), 519-543.

[3] Ambrosetti, A.; Azorero, G. J.; Peral, I, *Multiplicity results for some nonlinear elliptic equations,* J. Funct. Anal. 137 (1996) 219-242.

[4] Applebaum, D., *Lévy processes from probability to finance and quantum groups*, Notices Amer. Math. Soc. 51 (2004), 1336-1347.

[5] Barrios, B.; Colorado, E.; Pablo, A.; Sánchez, U., *On some critical problems for the fractional Laplacian operator.* J. Differ. Eqns. 252 (2012) 6133-6162.

[6] Barrios, B.; Colorado, E., Servadei, R.; Soria, F., *A critical fractional equation with concave-convex power nonlinearities.* Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 32 (2015), no. 4, 875-900.

[7] Bartsch, T., *Infinitely many solutions of a symmetric Dirichlet problem* Nonlinear Anal., TMA 20 (1993), 1205?1216.

[8] Bartsch, T.; Willem, M., *On an elliptic equation with concave and convex nonlinearities.* Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. 123 (1995), no. 11, 3555-3561.

[9] Bertoin, J., *Lévy processes* Cambridge Tracts in Mathematics, vol. 121 (Cambridge University Press, 1996).

[10] Brandle, C.; Colorado, E.; Pablo, A.; Sánchez, U, *A concave-convex elliptic problem involving the fractional Laplacian.* Proc. R. Soc. Edinb. A 143 (2013)39-71.

[11] Binlin, Z; Molica Bisci, G; Servadei, R , *Superlinear nonlocal fractional problems with infinitely many solutions.* Nonlinearity 28 (2015), no. 7, 2247- 2264.

[12] Charro, F.; Colorado, E.; Peral, I., *Multiplicity of solutions to uniformly elliptic fully nonlinear equations with concave-convex right-hand side.* J. Diff. Eqns 246 (2009), 4221-4248.

[13] Chen, J., *Some further results on a semilinear equation with concave-convex nonlinearity.* Nonlinear Anal. 62 (2005), no. 1, 71-87

[14] Chen, W.; Deng, S., *The Nehari manifold for non-local elliptic operators involving concave-convex nonlinearities.* Z. Angew. Math. Phys. 66 (2015), no. 4, 1387-1400.

[15] Cont, R.; Tankov, P, *Financial modelling with jump processes.* FL, 2004.

[16] Cotsiolis, A.; Tavoularis, N. K., *Best constants for Sobolev inequalities for higher order fractional derivatives*, J. Math. Anal. Appl. 295 (2004), no. 1, 225-236.

[17] Damascelli, L.; Grossi, M.; Pacella, F., *Qualitative properties of positive solutions of semilinear elliptic equations in symmetric domains via the maximum principle,* Ann. Inst. H. Poincar Anal. Non Linaire 16 (1999) 631-652

[18] Di Nezza E.; Palatucci, G.; Valdinoci, E., *Hitchhikers guide to the fractional Sobolev spaces.* Bull. Sci. Math. 136, 521-573 (2012).

[19] Dipierro, S.; Medina, M.; Valdinoci, E., *Fractional elliptic problems with critical growth in the whole of* $\mathbb{R}^N$. Preprint, arXiv:1506.01748.

[20] García, A. J.; Peral, A. I., *Some results about the existence of a second positive solution in a quasilinear critical problem.* Indiana Univ. Math. J. 43 (1994), no. 3, 941–957.

[21] Herbst, Ira W., *Spectral theory of the operator* $(p^2 + m^2)^{\frac{1}{2}} Ze^2/r$, Comm. Math. Phys. 53 (1977), no. 3, 285-294.

[22] Ouyang, T.; Shi, J., *Exact multiplicity of positive solutions for a class of semilinear problem II,* J. Differential Equations 158 (1999) 94-151.

[23] Ghoussoub, N.; Shakerian, S., *Variational problems involving fractional Laplacians and critical singularities.* Adv. Nonlinear Stud. 15 (2015), no. 3, 527-555.

[24] Servadei, R.; Valdinoci, E., *Variational methods for non-local operators of elliptic type.* Discrete Contin. Dyn. Syst. 33 (2013), no. 5, 2105-2137.

[25] Servadei R.; Valdinoci, E., *The Brezis-Nirenberg result for the fractional Laplacian.* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 367 (2015), no. 1, 67-102.

[26] Servadei, R.; Valdinoci, E., *Mountain pass solutions for non-local elliptic operators.* J. Math. Anal. Appl. 389 (2012), no. 2, 887-898.

[27] Servadei, R.; Valdinoci, E., *Lewy-Stampacchia type estimates for variational inequalities driven by (non)local operators.* Rev. Mat. Iberoam. 29 (2013), no. 3, 1091-1126.

[28] Silvestre, L.; *Regularity of the obstacle problem for a fractional power of the Laplace operator.* Comm. Pure Appl. Math. 60 (2007), no. 1, 67-112.

[29] Tang, M., *Exact multiplicity for semilinear elliptic Dirichlet problems involving concave and convex nonlinearities,* Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A 133 (2003) 705-717.
[30] Tarantello, G.; *On non homogeneous elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponent.* Ann. Inst. H.Poincaré Anal. Non Linéaire 9 (1992) 281-309.
[31] Valdinoci, E, *From the long jump random walk to the fractional Laplacian*, Bol. Soc. Esp. Mat. Apl. SeMA No. 49 (2009), 33-44.
[32] Vlahos, L; Isliker, H; Kominis, K; Hizonidis, K; *Normal and anomalous diffusion : a tutorial*, in: T.Bountis(Ed.),Order and Chaos,10thVolume, Patras University Press, 2008.
[33] Willem, M., *Minimax theorems.* Progress in Nonlinear Differential Equations and their Applications, 24. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1996.
[34] Wu, T. F. , *On semilinear elliptic equations involving critical Sobolev exponents and sign-changing weight function,* Commun. Pure Appl. Anal. 7 (2008) 383-405.

Department of Mathematics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research, Dr. Homi Bhaba Road, Pune-411008, India
E-mail address: mousomi@iiserpune.ac.in, debangana18@gmail.com